arXiv:1108.1335v1 [math-ph] 5 Aug 2011

The Renormalization Group According to Balaban
I. Small Fields

J. Dimock *
Dept. of Mathematics
SUNY at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260

August 8, 2011

Abstract

This is an expository account of Balaban's approach to the renormalization group. The method is illustrated with a treatment of the the ultraviolet problem for the scalar ϕ^4 model on toroidal lattice in dimension $d = 3$. This yields another proof of the stability bound. In this first paper we analyze the small field contribution to the partition function.

1 Introduction

1.1 overview

Balaban has developed a very powerful renormalization group method for analyzing lattice quantum field theories. The characteristic feature is that after each renormalization group transformation a split is introduced into regions where the fields are large and regions where the fields are small. Then one sums over all possible splittings to cover the entire function space. In small field regions one can perform a detailed analysis of the effective actions, for example carrying out perturbative renormalization procedures. The large field region is treated crudely but makes a small contribution due to the fundamental stability of the interaction.

Using this approach Balaban has been able to treat some important problems in quantum field theory. These include an analyis of the ultraviolet problem for scalar QED in $d = 3$, [1] - [4], the ultraviolet problem for Yang Mills in $d = 3, 4$ [5] - [15], and the infrared problem for an N- component scalar field in $d \geq 3$ with a potential which has a deep minimum on the surface of a sphere, [16] - [22] (known as the the"N-vector model" or "linear σ-model").

These are all very difficult problems and for each problem the analysis strectches over many papers. As a result others have been slow to adopt the approach (exceptions are [37], [38], [23], [25], [26], [33]). But the basic strategy is fairly straightforward and it seems worthwhile to expose it in a simpler model. That is the purpose of this paper.

The model we choose is the scalar ϕ^4 model in dimension $d = 3$ and in a finite volume. This is a special case of the scalar QED model treated by Balaban, [1]- [4]. However we also incorporate many of the improvements which can be found in [16] - [22]. The treatment is also more efficient, avoiding the analysis of large orders of perturbation theory. Indeed we avoid perturbation theory entirely and use a dynamical systems approach to renormalization.

The analysis stretches over two papers. In this first paper we study a modified model in which the fields are all small (i.e bounded). The second paper controls the large field contributions. The

---

*dimock@buffalo.edu

treatment is mostly self-contained, however we sometimes refer to the original papers for technical results.

1.2 the model

The basic torus is $\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}} = (\mathbb{R}/L^{\mathsf{M}}\mathbb{Z})^3$ where L is a fixed large positive number and $\mathsf{M} \geq 0$ is a fixed nonnegative integer. It has volume $\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}}) = L^{3\mathsf{M}}$. In this torus we consider lattices with spacing $L^{-\mathsf{N}}$ defined by

$$\mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}}_{\mathsf{M}} = (L^{-\mathsf{N}}\mathbb{Z}/L^{\mathsf{M}}\mathbb{Z})^3 \tag{1}$$

also with volume $\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}}_{\mathsf{M}}) = \mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}}) = L^{3\mathsf{M}}$. If $\mathsf{N} < \mathsf{N}'$ then $\mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}}_{\mathsf{M}} \subset \mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}'}_{\mathsf{M}} \subset \mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}}$

Let $\phi : \mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}}_{\mathsf{M}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scalar field on the lattice. The lattice version of the ϕ^4 model is defined by the density

$$\rho^N(\phi) = \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2} < \phi, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu})\phi > + V^{\mathsf{N}}(\phi)\Big) = \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\|\partial\phi\|^2 + \bar{\mu}\|\phi\|^2 + V^{\mathsf{N}}(\phi)\Big) \tag{2}$$

Here the inner product is defined with a weighted sum written as an integral:

$$< u, v > = \int u(x)v(x)dx \equiv L^{-3\mathsf{N}} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}}_{\mathsf{M}}} u(x)v(x) \tag{3}$$

If $\{e_\mu\} = \{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ are oriented unit basis vectors the derivative in the direction e_μ is

$$(\partial_\mu\phi)(x) = (\phi(x + L^{-\mathsf{N}}e_\mu) - \phi(x))/L^{-\mathsf{N}} \tag{4}$$

and the Laplacian is $\Delta = -\partial^*\partial$. The parameter $\bar{\mu} > 0$ is a fixed mass-squared . The potential has the form

$$V^{\mathsf{N}}(\phi) = \varepsilon^{\mathsf{N}}\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu^{\mathsf{N}} \int \phi^2(x)dx + \frac{1}{4}\lambda \int \phi^4(x)dx \tag{5}$$

Here $\lambda > 0$ is a fixed coupling constant. The parameters $\varepsilon^{\mathsf{N}}, \mu^{\mathsf{N}}$ are energy and mass-squared counterterms which we allow to depend on the lattice spacing $L^{-\mathsf{N}}$. This is renormalization. The coupling constant λ requires no renormalization in this model.

We use our renormalization group method to study the partition function

$$\mathsf{Z}_{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}} = \int \rho^{\mathsf{N}}(\phi)\ d\phi^{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}} \qquad\qquad d\phi^{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}} = \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}}_{\mathsf{M}}} d\phi(x) \tag{6}$$

Actually it is convenient to study the relative partition function $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}}/\mathsf{Z}_{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}}(0)$ where $\mathsf{Z}_{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}}(0)$ is the free field partition with $V^{\mathsf{N}} = 0$.

A result of the analysis is the following stability bound, whose proof comes in the second paper.

Theorem 1. *For any $\lambda, \bar{\mu} > 0$ there is a choice of renormalization counterterms $E^{\mathsf{N}}, \mu^{\mathsf{N}}$ and a constant c such that such that*

$$\exp\Big(-c\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}})\Big) \leq \frac{\mathsf{Z}_{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}}}{\mathsf{Z}_{\mathsf{M},\mathsf{N}}(0)} \leq \exp\Big(\mathrm{cVol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}})\Big) \tag{7}$$

for all M, N.

This result is not new. The upper bound was first obtained by Glimm and Jaffe [35]. Their results were extended by Feldman and Osterwalder [34] who established various infinite volume limits for weak coupling. We have already mentioned the analysis of Balaban [1] - [4] which includes this result. An alternative renormalization group treatment for this problem was given by Brydges, Dimock, and Hurd [30] where further references can be found.

1.3 the scaled model

Before proceeding we scale the problem up to a unit lattice with large volume. This changes our ultraviolet problem to an infrared problem and puts us in the natural home for the renormalization group. The new lattice is $\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}}$ with volume $L^{3(\mathsf{M+N})}$ and unit lattice spacing. For fields $\Phi : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ we define

$$\rho_0^{\mathsf{N}}(\Phi) = \rho^{\mathsf{N}}(\Phi_{L^{-\mathsf{N}}}) \tag{8}$$

where $\Phi_{L^{-\mathsf{N}}} : \mathbb{T}^{-\mathsf{N}}_{\mathsf{M}} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\Phi_{L^{-N}}(x) = L^{N/2}\Phi(L^N x) \tag{9}$$

Making the change of variables $\phi = \Phi_{L^{-N}}$ in the partition function we have

$$\mathsf{Z}_{\mathsf{M,N}} = \int \rho_0^{\mathsf{N}}(\Phi)\ d\Phi^{\mathsf{M,N}} \qquad\qquad d\Phi^{\mathsf{M,N}} = \prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}}} d\Phi(x) \tag{10}$$

There should actually be a factor $(L^{N/2})^{|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}}|/2}$ here, but since it makes no contribution to the relative partition function we have dropped it.

This scaling preserves the Laplacian term and we have

$$\rho_0^{\mathsf{N}}(\Phi) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} < \Phi, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_0^{\mathsf{N}})\Phi > - V_0^{\mathsf{N}}(\Phi)\right) \tag{11}$$

where the inner product is now on the unit lattice and

$$V_0^{\mathsf{N}}(\Phi) = \varepsilon_0^{\mathsf{N}}|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}}| + \frac{1}{2}\mu_0^{\mathsf{N}}\sum_x \Phi^2(x) + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_0^{\mathsf{N}}\sum_x \Phi^4(x) \tag{12}$$

The fixed coupling constants have scaled to

$$\bar{\mu}_0^{\mathsf{N}} = L^{-2\mathsf{N}}\bar{\mu} \qquad \lambda_0^{\mathsf{N}} = L^{-\mathsf{N}}\lambda \tag{13}$$

and the counterterms have scaled to

$$\varepsilon_0^{\mathsf{N}} = L^{-3\mathsf{N}}E^{\mathsf{N}} \qquad \mu_0^{\mathsf{N}} = L^{-2\mathsf{N}}\mu^N \tag{14}$$

The subscripts "zero" indicate that we are at the starting point of our renormalization group iteration. In the following we generally omit the superscript N. Thus ρ_0^N, V_0^N are denoted ρ_0, V_0, and $\lambda_0^N, \bar{\mu}_0^N, \mu_0^N, \varepsilon_0^N$ are denoted $\lambda_0, \bar{\mu}_0, \mu_0, \varepsilon_0$.

2 The RG transformation

2.1 block averaging

The renormalization group (RG) is a series of transformations which average out the short distance features of the model, leaving only the the long distance properties in which we are interested (now that we have scaled the model).

First we define averaging operators. On the lattice $L^{-k}\mathbb{Z}^3$, or any associated toroidal lattice, the averaging operator Q takes functions f on $L^{-k}\mathbb{Z}^3$ to functions Qf on $L^{-k+1}\mathbb{Z}^3$ by

$$(Qf)(y) = L^{-3}\sum_{x \in B(y)} f(x) \tag{15}$$

Here $B(y)$ is cubes of L^3 sites (L on a side) in $L^{-k}\mathbb{Z}^3$ centered on $y \in L^{-k+1}\mathbb{Z}^3$. It can be written

$$B(y) = \{x \in L^{-k}\mathbb{Z}^3 : |x - y| \leq L^{-k+1}/2\} \tag{16}$$

The distance is $|x - y| = \sup_\mu |x_\mu - y_\mu|$ and we assume L is odd. The transpose operator Q^T with respect to the inner product (3) takes functions on $L^{-k+1}\mathbb{Z}^3$ to functions on $L^{-k}\mathbb{Z}^3$. It is computed to be

$$(Q^T f)(x) = f(y) \quad \text{if} \quad x \in B(y) \tag{17}$$

Then $QQ^T = I$ while Q^TQ is a projection operator onto the range of Q^T which is functions constant on the cubes.

Now starting with the density ρ_0 on functions $\Phi_0 : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ we define a transformed density $\tilde{\rho}_1$ on functions $\Phi^0_1 : \mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_1(\Phi^0_1) =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2L^2}\|\Phi^0_1 - Q\Phi_0\|^2\right) \rho_0(\Phi_0) \ \ d\Phi_0 \\ =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}aL|\Phi^0_1 - Q\Phi_0|^2\right) \rho_0(\Phi_0) \ \ d\Phi_0\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Here in the first expression norms are taken with the natural metric for the lattice so $\|\Phi_1\|^2 = L^3 \sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} |\Phi_1(x)|^2$. In the second expression we use an unweighted sum $|\Phi_1|^2 = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} |\Phi_1(x)|^2$. The positive constant a is arbitrary and the normalization constant is [1]

$$\mathcal{N}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} = \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}aL|\Phi^0_1|^2\right) d\Phi_1 = \left(\frac{2\pi}{aL}\right)^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}|/2} \tag{19}$$

the constant is chosen so that

$$\int \tilde{\rho}_1(\Phi^0_1) \ \ d\Phi^0_1 = \int \rho_0(\Phi_0) \ d\Phi_0 \tag{20}$$

Now one scales back to the unit lattice. A function $\Phi_1 : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ scales up to $\Phi_{1,L} : \mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Phi_{1,L}(x) = L^{-1/2}\Phi_1(x/L) \tag{21}$$

and we define

$$\rho_1(\Phi_1) = \tilde{\rho}_1(\Phi_{1,L})L^{|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-1}|/2} \tag{22}$$

This preserves the integral

$$\int \rho_1(\Phi_1)d\Phi_1 = \int \rho_0(\Phi_0) \ d\Phi_0 \tag{23}$$

We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_1(\Phi_1) =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2L^2}\|\Phi_{1,L} - Q\Phi_0\|^2\right) \rho_0(\Phi_0) \ \ d\Phi_0 \\ =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2L^2}\|\Phi_{1,L} - Q\phi_L\|^2\right) \rho_0(\phi_L) \ \ d\phi^{(1)} \\ =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2}\|\Phi_1 - Q\phi\|^2\right) \rho_0(\phi_L) \ \ d\phi^{(1)}\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

---

[1] In general if Ω is a set and $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ we define

$$\mathcal{N}_{a,\Omega} = \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}a|\Phi|^2\right) d\Phi = \left(\frac{2\pi}{a}\right)^{|\Omega|/2}$$

In the second step we have made the change of variables by $\Phi_0 = \phi_L$ where $\phi : \mathbb{T}^{-1}_{\mathsf{M+N}-1} \to \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$d\Phi_0 = L^{-|\mathbb{T}^{-1}_{\mathsf{M+N}-1}|/2} d\phi \equiv d\phi^{(1)} \tag{25}$$

In the last step we use that Q is scale invariant: $Q\phi_L = (Q\phi)_L$.

We repeat this step a number of times. After k steps we will have a density $\rho_k(\Phi_k)$ defined on functions $\Phi_k : \mathbb{T}^{0}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$. The next step is to define a density on functions $\Phi^0_{k+1} : \mathbb{T}^{1}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{a}{2L^2} \|\Phi^0_{k+1} - Q\Phi_k\|^2\right) \rho_k(\Phi_k) \ \ d\Phi_k \\ =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} aL |\Phi^0_{k+1} - Q\Phi_k|^2\right) \rho_k(\Phi_k) \ \ d\Phi_k \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Then one scales back to the unit lattice. If $\Phi_{k+1} : \mathbb{T}^{0}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ then $\Phi_{k+1,L} : \mathbb{T}^{1}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ and we define

$$\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) = \tilde{\rho}_k(\Phi_{k+1,L}) L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2} \tag{27}$$

Then we still have the normalization

$$\int \rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) d\Phi_{k+1} = \int \rho_k(\Phi_k) d\Phi_k = \int \rho_0(\Phi_0) \ d\Phi_0 \tag{28}$$

The various averaging operators can be composed into a single averaging operation over large cubes. A computation shows that

$$\rho_k(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a_k,\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} \int \exp\left(-\frac{a_k}{2} \|\Phi_k - Q_k\phi\|^2\right) \rho_0(\phi_{L^k}) \ \ d^{(k)}\phi \tag{29}$$

$$a_k = a\frac{1 - L^{-2}}{1 - L^{-2k}} \tag{30}$$

Here $\phi : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $Q_k = Q^k$ is an averaging operator over cubes $B_k(y)$ with L^{3k} sites (L^k on a side). The operator Q_k maps functions on $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$ to functions on $\mathbb{T}^{0}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$ and is given by

$$(Q_k f)(y) = L^{-3k} \sum_{x \in B_k(y)} f(x) = \int_{|x-y|<1/2} f(x) dx \tag{31}$$

We also have defined

$$d\phi^{(k)} = L^{-k|\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2} d\phi \tag{32}$$

2.2 free flow

Now suppose we only keep the quadratic part of ρ_0 so that

$$\rho_0(\Phi_0) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} < \Phi_0, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_0)\Phi_0 >\right) \tag{33}$$

Inserting this in (29) yields

$$\rho_k(\Phi_k) = \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a_k,\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} \int \exp(-S_k(\Phi_k, \phi)) \ \ d^{(k)}\phi \tag{34}$$

where

$$S_k(\Phi_k, \phi) = \frac{a_k}{2} \|\Phi_k - Q_k\phi\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} < \phi, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k)\phi > \tag{35}$$

wtih

$$\bar{\mu}_k = L^{2k}\bar{\mu}_0 = L^{-2(N-k)}\bar{\mu} \tag{36}$$

To compute this we look for the minimizer of $S_k(\Phi_k, \phi)$ in ϕ. The minimizer satisfies the equation

$$(-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k \ Q_k^T Q_k)\phi = a_k Q_k^T \Phi_k \tag{37}$$

The solution involves the inverse

$$G_k = (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k \ Q_k^T Q_k)^{-1} \tag{38}$$

and has the form $\phi = \phi_k(\Phi_k)$ defined by

$$\phi_k(\Phi_k) = a_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k \tag{39}$$

We shift the integration in (34) so it is centered on the minimum. We take $\phi = \phi_k + \mathcal{Z}$ where $\mathcal{Z} : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ is the new integration variable. The cross terms vanish and so

$$S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k + \mathcal{Z}) = S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k) + \frac{1}{2} < \mathcal{Z}, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k)\mathcal{Z} > \tag{40}$$

Then (34) becomes

$$\rho_k(\Phi_k) = Z_k \ \exp(-S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k)) \tag{41}$$

where

$$Z_k = \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a_k, \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} \int \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2} < \mathcal{Z}, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k^N + a_k Q_k^T Q_k)\mathcal{Z} > \Big) \ d^{(k)}\mathcal{Z} \tag{42}$$

Here is another representation of $S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k)$. With $\phi_k = a_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k) =& \frac{a_k}{2}\|\Phi_k\|^2 - a_k < \phi_k, Q_k^T \Phi_k > + \frac{1}{2}\Big\langle \phi_k, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k)\phi_k \Big\rangle \\
=& \frac{a_k}{2}\|\Phi_k\|^2 - a_k^2 < \Phi_k, Q_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k > + \frac{a_k^2}{2}\Big\langle G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k, \Big(-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + Q_k^T Q_k \Big) G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k \Big\rangle \\
=& \frac{a_k}{2}\|\Phi_k\|^2 - \frac{a_k^2}{2} < \Phi_k, Q_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k > \\
\equiv& \frac{1}{2} < \Phi_k, \Delta_k \Phi_k >
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where the last line defines Δ_k.

2.3 single step free flow

Now one can forget everyting in the previous section except the definitons of S_k, ϕ_k, Δ_k. We give an alternative derivation of the identity $\rho_k(\Phi_k) = Z_k \ \exp(-S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k))$ for the free case. This is an inductive procedure. We assume that the identity holds for for ρ_k and show it holds for ρ_{k+1}. This approach will generate some useful identities and provide guidance for the treatment of the general case with the potential added.

Starting with the identity for k we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL, \mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} Z_k \int \exp\Big(-\frac{a}{2L^2}\|\Phi^0_{k+1} - Q\Phi_k\|^2 - S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k) \Big) \ \ d\Phi_k \\
=& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL, \mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} Z_k \int \exp\Big(-J(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \Phi_k, \phi_k) \Big) \ \ d\Phi_k
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where

$$J(\Phi^0_{k+1},\Phi_k,\phi) \equiv \frac{a}{2L^2}\|\Phi^0_{k+1}-Q\Phi_k\|^2+\frac12 a_k\|\Phi_k-Q_k\phi\|^2+\frac12\|\partial\phi\|^2+\frac12\bar\mu_k\|\phi\|^2 \tag{45}$$

Here Φ^0_{k+1},Φ_k,ϕ are fields on $\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k},\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k},\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}$ respectively.

To compute the integral we want to minimize $J(\Phi^0_{k+1},\Phi_k,\phi_k)$ in Φ_k. But $J(\Phi^0_{k+1},\Phi_k,\phi_k)$ is the minimum value of $J(\Phi^0_{k+1},\Phi_k,\phi)$ in ϕ. This suggests we study the minimizer of $J(\Phi^0_{k+1},\Phi_k,\phi)$ in Φ_k,ϕ simultaneously. [2]

For the next lemma we need the operator

$$G^0_{k+1}=\Big(-\Delta+\bar\mu_k+a_{k+1}L^{-2}Q^T_{k+1}Q_{k+1}\Big)^{-1} \tag{46}$$

defined on functions on $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}$. This scales to G_{k+1} as we will see.

Lemma 2.

1. *The unique minimum of $J(\Phi^0_{k+1},\Phi_k,\phi)$ comes at $(\Phi_k,\phi)=(\Psi_k,\phi^0_{k+1})$ where*

   $$\phi^0_{k+1}=\phi^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1})=L^{-2}a_{k+1}G^0_{k+1}Q^T_{k+1}\Phi^0_{k+1} \tag{47}$$

   and where

   $$\Psi_k=\Psi_k(\Phi^0_{k+1},\phi^0_{k+1})=Q_k\phi^0_{k+1}-\frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k+aL^{-2}}Q^TQ_{k+1}\phi^0_{k+1}+\frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k+aL^{-2}}Q^T\Phi^0_{k+1} \tag{48}$$

2. *The minimizer in ϕ can also be written $\phi_k(\Psi_k)$ so we have the identity between functions of Φ^0_{k+1}*

   $$\phi^0_{k+1}=\phi_k(\Psi_k) \tag{49}$$

3. *The value of $J(\Phi^0_{k+1},\Phi_k,\phi)$ at the minimizers is*

   $$S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1},\phi^0_{k+1})=\frac12\frac{a_{k+1}}{L^2}\|\Phi^0_{k+1}-Q_{k+1}\phi^0_{k+1}\|^2+\frac12\|\partial\phi^0_{k+1}\|^2+\frac12\bar\mu_k\|\phi^0_{k+1}\|^2 \tag{50}$$

Proof.

1. The variational equations are

   $$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta+\bar\mu_k+a_kQ_k^TQ_k)\phi =&a_kQ_k^T\Phi_k\\ \Big(a_k+\frac{a}{L^2}Q^TQ\Big)\Phi_k =&a_kQ_k\phi+\frac{a}{L^2}Q^T\Phi^0_{k+1}\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

   which we solve simultaneously. The second is solved by $\Phi_k=\Psi_k$ where

   $$\begin{aligned}\Psi_k(\Phi^0_{k+1},\phi)=&a_k^{-1}\Big(I-\frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k+aL^{-2}}Q^TQ\Big)\big(a_kQ_k\phi+\frac{a}{L^2}Q^T\Phi^0_{k+1}\big)\\ =&Q_k\phi-\frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k+aL^{-2}}Q^TQ_{k+1}\phi+\frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k+aL^{-2}}Q^T\Phi^0_{k+1}\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

---

[2] If A,B are two sets and $f:A\times B\to\mathbb{R}$ then

$$\inf_{y\in B}\big(\inf_{x\in A}f(x,y)\big)=\inf_{x\in A,y\in B}f(x,y)=\inf_{x\in A}\big(\inf_{y\in B}f(x,y)\big)$$

If the minimizers are unique then they must come at the same point.

Then

$$a_k Q_k^T \Psi_k = a_k Q_k^T Q_k \phi - a_{k+1} L^{-2} Q_{k+1}^T Q_{k+1} \phi + a_{k+1} L^{-2} Q_{k+1}^T \Phi_{k+1}^0 \tag{53}$$

where we used

$$a_{k+1} = \frac{a_k a}{a_k + aL^{-2}} \tag{54}$$

Substitute (53) into the first equation in (51) and find

$$(-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_{k+1} L^{-2} Q_{k+1}^T Q_{k+1})\phi = a_{k+1} L^{-2} Q_{k+1}^T \Phi_{k+1}^0 \tag{55}$$

This has the solution $\phi = \phi_{k+1}^0 = L^{-2} a_{k+1} G_k^0 Q_{k+1}^T \Phi_{k+1}^0$. Substituting this into (52) gives the result.

2. The minimizers solve the equations (51). The first equation gives the result.

3. We compute using $QQ^T = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} Q\Psi_k =& Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0 - \frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k + aL^{-2}} Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0 + \frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k + aL^{-2}} \Phi_{k+1}^0 \\ =& \frac{a_k}{a_k + aL^{-2}} Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0 + \frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k + aL^{-2}} \Phi_{k+1}^0 \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

Thus

$$\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q\Psi_k = \frac{a_k}{a_k + aL^{-2}} (\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0) \tag{57}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a}{2L^2} \|\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q\Psi_k\|^2 =& \frac{a}{2L^2} \left(\frac{a_k}{a_k + aL^{-2}} \right)^2 \|\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 \\ =& \frac{a_{k+1}}{2L^2} \frac{a_k}{a_k + aL^{-2}} \|\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

On the other hand from (48) we compute using $\|Q^T \Phi\|^2 = \|\Phi\|^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} a_k \|\Psi_k - Q_k \phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 =& \frac{1}{2} a_k \left(\frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k + aL^{-2}} \right)^2 \|\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 \\ =& \frac{a_{k+1}}{2L^2} \frac{aL^{-2}}{a_k + aL^{-2}} \|\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Then using the last two equations the value at the minimum is

$$\begin{aligned} J(\Phi_{k+1}^0, \Psi_k, \phi_{k+1}^0) =& \frac{a}{2L^2} \|\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q\Psi_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} a_k \|\Psi_k - Q_k \phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial \phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\mu}_k \|\phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 \\ =& \frac{a_{k+1}}{2L^2} \|\Phi_{k+1}^0 - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|\partial \phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\mu}_k \|\phi_{k+1}^0\|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

This completes the proof.

Lemma 3. *Let* $\rho_k(\Phi_k) = Z_k \ \exp(-S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k))$. *Then*

1. $\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}$ *is given by*

$$\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}^0) = Z_k \ \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL, \mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{N}+\mathsf{M}-k}} (2\pi)^{|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}|/2} (\det C_k)^{1/2} \exp\Big(- S_{k+1}^0(\Phi_{k+1}^0, \phi_{k+1}^0) \Big) \tag{61}$$

where

$$C_k = \Big(\Delta_k + \frac{a}{L^2} Q^T Q \Big)^{-1} \tag{62}$$

2. *For* $\Phi_{k+1} : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k-1} \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\phi^0_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1,L}) = [\phi_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1})]_L \tag{63}$$

and

$$\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) \equiv \tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1,L}) L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2} = Z_{k+1} \exp\Big(- S_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}, \phi_{k+1})\Big) \tag{64}$$

where

$$Z_{k+1} = Z_k \ \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} (2\pi)^{|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2} (\det C_k)^{1/2} \tag{65}$$

Proof.

1. We calculate $\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}$ given in (44) by expanding around the minimum is Φ_k. We we write $\Phi_k = \Psi_k + Z$ and integrate over $Z : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ instead of Φ_k. We have from (49)

$$\phi_k(\Psi_k + Z) = \phi^0_{k+1} + \mathcal{Z}_k \tag{66}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}_k : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{Z}_k = \phi_k(Z) = a_k G_k Q^T_k Z \tag{67}$$

Thus we are expanding $J(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \Phi_k, \phi_k)$ around the minimum in the last two variables. We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & J(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \Psi_k + Z, \phi^0_{k+1} + \mathcal{Z}_k) \\ =& S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \phi^0_{k+1}) + \frac{a}{2L^2}\|QZ\|^2 + S_k(Z, \mathcal{Z}_k) \\ =& S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \phi^0_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2}\Big\langle Z, \Big(\Delta_k + \frac{a}{L^2}Q^TQ\Big)Z\Big\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Indeed we have already seen that $S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \phi^0_{k+1})$ is the minimum value. The linear terms in $Z, \mathcal{Z}_k$ must vanish. The quadratic terms in $Z, \mathcal{Z}_k$ are as indicated. The second form follows from (43).

Inserting this last expression into (44) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{N+M}-k}} Z_k \exp(-S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \phi^0_{k+1})) \\ & \int \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\Big\langle Z, (\Delta_k + \frac{a}{L^2}Q^TQ)Z\Big\rangle\right) dZ \end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

We evaluate the last integral as $(2\pi)^{|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2}(\det C_k)^{1/2}$ which gives the result.

2. We scale by $f_L(x) = L^{-1/2}f(x/L)$. The averaging operator Q is scale invariant and $\bar{\mu}_k = L^{-2}\bar{\mu}_{k+1}$ so we compute

$$\Big(- \Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_{k+1}L^{-2}Q^T_{k+1}Q_{k+1}\Big) f_L = L^{-2}\Big[\big(- \Delta + \bar{\mu}_{k+1} + a_{k+1}Q^T_{k+1}Q_{k+1}\big) f\Big]_L \tag{70}$$

It follows that the inverses satisfy $G^0_{k+1}f_L = L^2[G_{k+1}f]_L$ and so

$$\phi^0_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1,L}) = L^{-2}a_{k+1}G^0_{k+1}Q^T_{k+1}\Phi_{k+1,L} = [a_{k+1}G_{k+1}Q^T_{k+1}\Phi_{k+1}]_L = [\phi_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1})]_L \tag{71}$$

Now in $\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} S^0_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1,L}, \phi_{k+1,L}) =& \frac{1}{2}\frac{a_{k+1}}{L^2}\|\Phi_{k+1,L} - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1,L}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial\phi_{k+1,L}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mu}_k\|\phi_{k+1,L}\|^2 \\ =& \frac{1}{2}a_{k+1}\|\Phi_{k+1} - Q_{k+1}\phi_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial\phi_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mu}_{k+1}\|\phi_{k+1}\|^2 \\ =& S_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}, \phi_{k+1}) \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Thus

$$\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) = Z_k \ \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{a,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{N+M}-k}} (2\pi)^{|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2} (\det C_k)^{1/2} \exp\Big(- S_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}, \phi_{k+1})\Big) \tag{73}$$

and the constant is identified as Z_{k+1}.

2.4 random walk expansion

We develop a random walk expansion for the the Green's function $G_k = (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k)^{-1}$ on $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$. This will gives us estimates on G_k and also provide the basis of localized approximations to G_k.

The random walk expansion is based on localized inverses which we now define. Let $M = L^m$ and let $\square_z$ be a large cube in $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$ of linear size M centered on points $z \in \mathbb{T}^m_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$. The centers are a distance M apart so the $\square_z$ partition the lattice. Also let $\tilde{\square}_z$ be a cube in $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$ of linear size $2M$ still centered on points $z \in \mathbb{T}^m_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$. These cubes overlap. For $\tilde{\square} = \tilde{\square}_z$ let $\Delta^N_{\tilde{\square}}$ be the Laplacian on $\tilde{\square}$ with Neumann boundary conditions. This means that in $(\phi, -\Delta^N_{\tilde{\square}}\phi) = \sum_{x,\mu} |\partial_\mu \phi(x)|^2$ only terms with both $x, x + L^{-k}e_\mu \in \tilde{\square}$ contribute. Now restrict the operator $-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k$ to $\tilde{\square}$ with the Neumann conditions and take the inverse defining

$$G_k(\tilde{\square}) = \big[- \Delta^N + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k \big]^{-1}_{\tilde{\square}} \tag{74}$$

This satisfies the following estimates. Let $\Delta_y = B_k(y)$ be unit cubes in $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$ centered on points $y \in \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$. These partition the lattice and any large cube $\square$ or $\tilde{\square}$. Let $y, y' \in \tilde{\square}$ and let $x \in \Delta_y$ and $\text{supp} f \subset \Delta_{y'}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |(G_k(\tilde{\square})f)(x)| \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\gamma_0 d(y,y')} \|f\|_\infty \\ |(\partial G_k(\tilde{\square})f)(x)| \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\gamma_0 d(y,y')} \|f\|_\infty \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

We also estimate the Holder derivative of $\partial G_k(\tilde{\square})$ of order $1/2 < \alpha < 1$. For $x, x' \in \Delta(y)$ and $\text{supp} f \subset \Delta(y')$

$$|(\delta_\alpha \partial G_k(\tilde{\square})f)(x,x')| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\gamma_0 d(y,y')} \|f\|_\infty \tag{76}$$

Here δ_α is defined for $d(x,x') \leq 1$ by

$$(\delta_\alpha f)(x,x') = \frac{f(x) - f(x')}{d(x,x')^\alpha} \tag{77}$$

Here and throughout the paper constants denoted $\mathcal{O}(1)$ depend only on the dimension. An exception is the last estimate where $\mathcal{O}(1)$ depends on α. The constant γ_0 depends only on the dimension. For the proofs, which are rather involved, see [4] and also [6], [18].

A random walk or path is a sequence of points in the lattice $\mathbb{T}^m_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}$ with spacing $M = L^m$ written

$$\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \tag{78}$$

such that ω_j, ω_{j+1} are neighbors in the sense that for each component $|\omega_{j,\mu} - \omega_{j+1,\mu}| \leq M$. Thus ω_j has $3^d = 9$ neighbors counting itself. The number of steps in the walk is $|\omega| = n$.

Lemma 4. *The Green's function G_k has a random walk expansion of the form*

$$G_k = \sum_{\omega} G_{k,\omega} \tag{79}$$

where the sum is over all paths ω. If M is sufficiently large the series for $G_k, \partial G_k, \delta_\alpha \partial G_k$ all converge and give for $x, x' \in \Delta_y$ and $\mathrm{supp} f \subset \Delta(y')$

$$\begin{aligned} |(G_k f)(x)| \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y,y'))\|f\|_\infty \\ |(\partial G_k f)(x)| \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y,y'))\|f\|_\infty \\ |(\delta_\alpha \partial G_k f)(x,x')| \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y,y'))\|f\|_\infty \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Proof. We construct a partition of unity. Let $h \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(-2/3, -2/3)$ satisfy $h \geq 0$ and $h = 1$ on $(-1/3, 1/3)$ and

$$1 = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} h^2(x-n) \tag{81}$$

Then for $z \in \mathbb{T}^m_{N+M-k}$ define h_z on $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{N+M-k}$ by

$$h_z(x) = \prod_{\mu=1}^d h\left(\frac{x_\mu - z_\mu}{M}\right) \tag{82}$$

Then h_z has support in $\tilde{\Box}_z$ so $h_z h_{z'} = 0$ unless z, z' are neighbors. We have

$$1 = \sum_z h_z^2(x) \tag{83}$$

Furthermore

$$|\partial h| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) M^{-1} \qquad |\partial\partial h| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) M^{-2} \tag{84}$$

Define a parametrix G_k^* by

$$G_k^* = \sum_z h_z G_k(\tilde{\Box}_z) h_z \tag{85}$$

Then we have

$$(-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k) G_k^* = I - \sum_z R_z G(\tilde{\Box}_z) h_z \equiv I - R \tag{86}$$

where

$$R_z = -\left[(-\Delta + a_k Q_k^T Q_k), h_z\right] \tag{87}$$

The solution is now

$$G_k = G_k^* (I - R)^{-1} = G_k^* \sum_{n=0}^\infty R^n \tag{88}$$

provided the series converges. This can also be written as the random walk expansion

$$\begin{aligned} G_k = & \sum_{n=0}^\infty \sum_{\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_n} \Big(h_{\omega_0} G_k(\tilde{\Box}_{\omega_0}) h_{\omega_0}\Big)\Big(R_{\omega_1} G_k(\tilde{\Box}_{\omega_1}) h_{\omega_1}\Big) \cdots \Big(R_{\omega_n} G_k(\tilde{\Box}_{\omega_n}) h_{\omega_n}\Big) \\ \equiv & \sum_\omega G_{k,\omega} \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Now we claim that for $x \in \Delta_y$

$$|(R_z f)(x)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) M^{-1}\Big(\|1_{\Delta_y} f\|_\infty + \|1_{\Delta_y} \partial f\|_\infty \Big) \tag{90}$$

Indeed the term $[-\Delta, h_z]$ is local and involves derivatives of h so we get the factor M^{-1} from (84). The term $\left[Q_k^T Q_k, h_z\right]$ is also local and also can be expressed in term of derivatives of h_z since it can be written

$$\Big(\left[Q_k^T Q_k, h_z\right] f \Big)(x) = \int_{x' \in \Delta(y)} (h_z(x') - h_z(x)) f(x') dx' \tag{91}$$

Combining the bound on R_z with the basic bound (75) on $G_k(\tilde{\square})$ yields for $x \in \Delta_y$ and supp$f \subset \Delta_{y'}$:

$$\begin{aligned} |(R_z G_k(\tilde{\square}_z) f)(x)| \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) M^{-1} \Big(\|1_{\Delta_y} G_k(\tilde{\square}_z) f\|_\infty + \|1_{\Delta_y} \partial G_k(\tilde{\square}_z) f\|_\infty \Big) \\ \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) M^{-1} \exp(-\gamma_0 d(y, y')) \|f\|_\infty \end{aligned} \tag{92}$$

We use this bound repeatedly on $G_{k,\omega}$ with $|\omega| = n$. We have for $x \in \Delta_y$ and supp$f \subset \Delta_{y'}$ with $y_0 = y, y_{n+1} = y'$

$$\begin{aligned} & |(G_{k,\omega} f)(x)| \\ = & \Big| \Big((h_{\omega_0} G_k(\tilde{\square}_{\omega_0}) h_{\omega_0} \Big) \Big(R_{\omega_1} G_k(\tilde{\square}_{\omega_1}) h_{\omega_1} \Big) \cdots \Big(R_{\omega_n} G_k(\tilde{\square}_{\omega_n}) h_{\omega_n} \Big) f \Big)(x) \Big| \\ \leq & \sum_{y_1, \dots, y_n} \Big| \Big((h_{\omega_0} G_k(\tilde{\square}_{\omega_0}) h_{\omega_0} \Big) 1_{\Delta_{y_1}} \Big(R_{\omega_1} G_k(\tilde{\square}_{\omega_1}) h_{\omega_1} \Big) 1_{\Delta_{y_2}} \cdots 1_{\Delta_{y_n}} \Big(R_{\omega_n} G_k(\tilde{\square}_{\omega_n}) h_{\omega_n} \Big) f \Big)(x) \Big| \\ \leq & (\mathcal{O}(1) M)^{-n} \sum_{y_1, \dots, y_n} \prod_{j=0}^{n} e^{-\gamma_0 d(y_j, y_{j+1})} \|f\|_\infty \\ \leq & (\mathcal{O}(1) M)^{-n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y, y')} \|f\|_\infty \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

For convergence of the random walk expansion we have for M sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned} |(G_k f)(x)| \leq & \sum_{\omega} |(G_{k,\omega} f)(x)| \\ \leq & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\omega : |\omega| = n} (\mathcal{O}(1) M^{-1})^n e^{-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y, y')} \|f\|_\infty \\ \leq & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{O}(1) M^{-1})^n (3d)^n e^{-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y, y')} \|f\|_\infty \\ \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y, y')} \|f\|_\infty \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

This establishes the bound on G_k and the bounds on ∂G_k and $\delta_\alpha \partial G_k$ are similar. This completes the proof.

The bounds of the lemma yield (more elementary) global estimates:

Corollary 5. *For any* $f : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$

$$|G_k f|, \ |\partial G_k f|, \ |\delta_\alpha \partial G_k f| \ \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|f\|_\infty \tag{95}$$

Proof. For $x \in \Delta_y$

$$|(G_k f)(x)| \leq \sum_{y'} |(G_k 1_{\Delta_{y'}} f)(x)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{y'} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}\gamma_0 d(y, y')) \|f\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \|f\|_\infty \tag{96}$$

The others are similar.

2.5 decoupling

We also we need a version of G_k in which the communication between sites is systematically weakened.

For each M-cube $\square$ introduce a variable $s_\square$ with $0 \leq s_\square \leq 1$. Then define for $\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$

$$s_\omega = \prod_{\square \subset X_\omega} s_\square \qquad X_\omega = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} \tilde{\square}_{\omega_j} \tag{97}$$

Note that $\tilde{\square}_{\omega_0}$ is omitted from X_ω. Hence if ω is only a single point ω_0 (i.e. $|\omega| = 0$) then X_ω is empty and in this case we set $s_\omega = 1$.

Now we define for $s = \{s_\square\}$

$$G_k(s) = \sum_\omega s_\omega G_{k,\omega} \tag{98}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(1) &= \sum_\omega G_{k,\omega} = G_k \\ G_k(0) &= \sum_{\omega : |\omega| = 1} G_{k,\omega} = G_k^* \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Thus $G_k(s)$ interpolates between an operator for which all sites are coupled and an operator for which keeps thing localized in each cube $\tilde{\square}$.

Note that $G_k(s)$ can be defined and bounded for $s_\square$ complex and in a much large domain. We can take for example $|s_\square| \leq M^{1/2}$. Then in (94) instead of $(\mathcal{O}(1)M^{-1})^n$ we have $(\mathcal{O}(1)|s_\square|M^{-1})^n \leq (\mathcal{O}(1)M^{-1/2})^n$. The random walk expansion still converges if M is sufficiently large. The bounds (80) and (95) still hold for $G_k(s)$ with $|s_\square| \leq M^{1/2}$.

3 Localized functionals of the field

3.1 overview

Our main goal is to follow the flow of the renormalization group with the potential included. The detailed analysis is in the next section. Here we do some preliminary work.

After k steps with certain small field assumptions we will find that the density can be written in a the following form .

$$\rho_k(\Phi_k) = \text{const} \exp\left(-S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k) + \varepsilon_k \text{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_k \int \phi_k^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda_k \int \phi_k^4 + E_k(\phi_k) \right) \tag{100}$$

Here $\phi_k = a_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k$ as before and $S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k)$ is the free action as defined in (35). In the next terms we track the growth of energy density ε_k and the mass-squared μ_k. We could do this as well with the coupling constant, but for this model it is sufficient to just let it scale and define

$$\lambda_k = L^k \lambda_0 = L^{-(N-k)} \lambda \tag{101}$$

We will only be interested in N, k, λ such that λ_k is small.

The term E_k is real-valued and contains all non-leading and non-local corrections to the simple local form we have isolated. However it has some local structure which we now explain. Again consider cubes $\square$ with side of length $M = L^m$ centered on points of the lattice $\mathbb{T}^m_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}$ which partition the lattice $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}$. An *$M$-polymer* X is a connected unions of such cubes. Here *connected* means that for any two cubes $\square, \square'$ in X there is a sequence $\square = \square_0, \square_1, \square_2, \dots, \square_m = \square'$ such that $\square_j \subset X$ and $\square_j$ and $\square_{j+1}$ have a $d-1=2$ dimensional face in common.

Now we define

$$\mathcal{D}_k = \text{ all } \ M\text{-polymers } X \text{ in } \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k} \tag{102}$$

We will assume the local structure

$$E_k(\phi_k) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{D}_k} E_k(X, \phi_k) \tag{103}$$

where $E_k(X, \phi_k)$ only depend on the restriction of ϕ_k to X.

3.2 small fields

Our small field assumption is chosen so that when it is violated either the term $\exp\left(-S_k(\Phi_k, \phi_k)\right)$ or the term $\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\lambda_k \int \phi_k^4\right)$ in the density is tiny. This is arranged as follows. Let

$$p_k = p(\lambda_k) = (-\log \lambda_k)^p = ((N-k)\log L - \log \lambda)^p \tag{104}$$

for some positive integer p. We assume always $\lambda_k < 1$ so the quantity we are exponentiating is positive.

Definition 1. *$\mathcal{S}_k$ is all functions $\Phi_k : \mathbb{T}^0_{M+N-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that with $\phi_k = a_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k$ on $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{N+M-k}$*

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_k - Q_k \phi_k| \leq & p_k \\ |\partial \phi_k| \leq & p_k \\ |\phi_k| \leq & \lambda_k^{-1/4} p_k \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

Since λ_k is assumed small, p_k is large, and these "small field" conditions actually allow rather large fields. If one of these conditions fails then we gain a tiny factor $\mathcal{O}(e^{-p_k})$.

In fact $E_k(X, \phi_k)$ will be the restriction of more general complex-valued functions $E_k(X, \phi)$ defined for complex fields $\phi : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k} \to \mathbb{C}$. We want to choose weaker restrictions on ϕ so that if $\phi = \phi_k \in \mathcal{S}_k$ then the new conditions are satisfied. We would also like bounds on $\phi, \partial\phi, \delta_\alpha \partial \phi$ to be all about the same size, however it is convenient to allow a little deviation. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 2. *Let ϵ be a fixed small positive number. $\mathcal{R}_k$ is all functions $\phi : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{N+M-k} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi| &< \lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} \\ |\partial \phi| &< \lambda_k^{-1/4-2\epsilon} \\ |\delta_\alpha \partial \phi| &< \lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon} \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

This does the job for we have:

Lemma 6. *Let $\Phi_k \in \mathcal{S}_k$. Then*

1. *$|\Phi_k| \leq 2 p_k \lambda_k^{-1/4}$ and $|\partial_\mu \Phi_k| \leq 3 p_k$.*
2. *For λ_k sufficiently small $\phi_k = a_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k \in \mathcal{R}_k$.*

Proof. For the first point we have

$$|\Phi_k| \leq |\Phi_k - Q_k \phi_k| + |Q_k \phi_k| \leq p_k + p_k \lambda_k^{-1/4} \leq 2 p_k \lambda_k^{-1/4} \tag{107}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned}|(\partial_\mu \Phi_k)(x)| =&|(\Phi_k)(x+e_\mu) - (\Phi_k)(x)| \\ \leq&|Q_k\phi_k(x+e_\mu) - Q_k\phi_k(x)| + 2p_k \\ \leq&\|\partial\phi_k\|_\infty + 2p_k \leq 3p_k\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

For the second point if λ_k is small we have have $p_k \leq \lambda_k^{-\epsilon}$ since

$$p_k = (-\log\lambda_k)^p \leq p!\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)^p e^{\frac{1}{2}\epsilon(-\log\lambda_k)} = p!\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right)^p \lambda_k^{-\epsilon/2} \leq \lambda_k^{-\epsilon} \tag{109}$$

The bounds on $\phi_k, \partial\phi_k$ follow directly. Furthermore by (95) and $\|Q_k^T\Phi_k\|_\infty \leq \|\Phi_k\|_\infty$ and $p_k \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{-\epsilon/2}$

$$|\delta_\alpha\partial\phi_k| = |a_k\delta_\alpha\partial G_k Q_k^T\Phi_k| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|\Phi_k\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{O}(1)p_k\lambda_k^{-1/4} \leq \lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon} \tag{110}$$

This completes the proof.

3.3 norms

The functions $E(X,\phi)$ form a complex vector space. We add a few more conditions and define a subspace:

Definition 3. *$\mathcal{K}_k$ = all $E : \mathcal{D}_k \times \mathcal{R}_k \to \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&(a.)\ E(X,\phi)\ \textit{only depends on}\ \phi\ \textit{in}\ X\in\mathcal{D}_k \\ &(b.)\ E(X,\phi)\ \textit{is analytic and bounded in}\ \phi\in\mathcal{R}_k. \\ &(c.)\ E(X,\phi)\ \textit{is even in}\ \phi \\ &(d.)\ E(X,\phi)\ \textit{is invariant under lattice symmetries}\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

In fact we are mainly interested in the real subspace

$$\mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{K}_k) = \{E \in \mathcal{K}_k : \overline{E(\phi)} = E(\overline{\phi})\} \tag{112}$$

Elements $E(X,\phi)$ of this space are real for real fields ϕ.

We introduce a norm on these spaces. For the ϕ dependence we define for each $X \in \mathcal{D}_k$:

$$\|E(X)\|_k = \sup_{\phi\in\mathcal{R}_k}\|E(X,\phi)\| \tag{113}$$

We also need to describe how $E(X)$ decays in X. For any $X \in \mathcal{D}_k$ define $d_M(X)$ by:

$$Md_M(X) = \text{ the length of the shortest tree joining the } M\text{-cubes in } X. \tag{114}$$

Here the tree is in the continuum torus $\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} = (\mathbb{R}/(L^{\mathsf{M+N}-k})\mathbb{Z})^3$. We expect $E(X)$ to decay exponentially in $d_M(X)$ so we define our norm by

$$\|E\|_{k,\kappa} = \sup_X \|E(X)\|_k e^{\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{115}$$

The norm depends on a parameter $\kappa > 0$. With any of these norms the space $\mathcal{K}_k$ is complete and hence a complex Banach space. The space $\mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{K}_k)$ is a real Banach space.

We elaborate a bit on the these definitions. First define

$$|X|_M = \mathrm{Vol}(X)/M^3 = \text{ number of } M\text{-cubes in } X. \tag{116}$$

Then we have the inequalities [21]

$$d_M(X) \leq |X|_M \leq 3^d(1 + d_M(X)) \tag{117}$$

here with $d = 3$.

Secondly it is a variation of a standard bound (see appendix A) that there are constants κ_0, K_0 depending only on the dimension, so that for any M-cube $\square$

$$\sum_{X \supset \square} e^{-\kappa_0 d_M(X)} \leq K_0 \tag{118}$$

We assume that $\kappa \geq \kappa_0$ and then for $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_k$

$$\sum_{X \supset \square} |E(X, \phi)| \leq \sum_{X \supset \square} \|E(X)\|_k \leq \|E\|_{k,\kappa} \sum_{X \supset \square} e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \leq K_0 \|E\|_{k,\kappa} \tag{119}$$

In fact for later purposes we will assume $\kappa \geq 5\kappa_0$.

3.4 rescaling and reblocking

We want to know how these localized functionals scale. First some definitions.

An LM-polymer Y in $\mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}$ is a connected union of $LM = L^{m+1}$ cubes centered on the points of $\mathbb{T}^{m+1}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}$. The set of all LM polymers is denoted $\mathcal{D}^0_{k+1}$. For such Y we have that $L^{-1}Y$ is an M-polymer in $\mathbb{T}^{-k-1}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k-1}$ so $L^{-1}\mathcal{D}^0_{k+1} = \mathcal{D}_{k+1}$. We let $\mathcal{K}^0_{k+1}$ be the space of all $F : \mathcal{D}^0_{k+1} \times \mathcal{R}_k \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying conditions like (111).

Now for $F \in \mathcal{K}^0_{k+1}$ define the scaled down functional $F_{L^{-1}} \in \mathcal{K}_{k+1}$ by

$$F_{L^{-1}}(X, \phi) = F(LX, \phi_L) \tag{120}$$

This is well-defined since $X \in \mathcal{D}_{k+1}$ implies $LX \in \mathcal{D}^0_{k+1}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ implies $\phi_L \in \mathcal{R}_k$ as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 7. *(scaling)*

1. *If* $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ *then* $\phi_L \in L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$
2. $\|F_{L^{-1}}(X)\|_{k+1} \leq \|F(LX)\|_k$

Proof. The first item follows from $\lambda_{k+1} = L\lambda_k$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
|\phi_L(x)| =& L^{-1/2}|\phi(x/L)| \leq L^{-1/2}\lambda_{k+1}^{-1/4-3\epsilon} = [L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}]\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} \\
|\partial\phi_L(x)| =& L^{-3/2}|\partial\phi(x/L)| \leq L^{-3/2}\lambda_{k+1}^{-1/4-2\epsilon} = [L^{-7/4-2\epsilon}]\lambda_k^{-1/4-2\epsilon} \\
|(\delta_\alpha\partial\phi)_L(x)| =& L^{-3/2-\alpha}|\delta_\alpha\partial\phi(x/L)| \leq L^{-3/2-\alpha}\lambda_{k+1}^{-1/4-\epsilon} = [L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}]\lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

The second is immediate. This completes the proof.

To prepare for scaling we need a reblocking operation. If $X \in \mathcal{D}_k$ let $\bar{X}^L \in \mathcal{D}^0_{k+1}$ be the intersection of all LM cubes intersecting X. Given $E \in \mathcal{K}_k$ we define functionals $\mathcal{B}E \in \mathcal{K}^0_{k+1}$ by

$$(\mathcal{B}E)(Y, \phi) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{D}_k : \bar{X}^L = Y} E(X, \phi) \tag{122}$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{X \in \mathcal{D}_k} E(X,\phi) = \sum_{Y \in \mathcal{D}^0_{k+1}} (\mathcal{B}E)(Y,\phi) \tag{123}$$

Combining the reblocking with scaling we have a map $E \to (BE)_{L^{-1}}$ from $\mathcal{K}_k$ to $\mathcal{K}_{k+1}$ given by

$$(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}(Z,\phi) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{D}_k : \bar{X}^L = LZ} E(X,\phi_L) \tag{124}$$

Then we have

$$(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}(\phi) \equiv \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{D}_{k+1}} (\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}(Z,\phi) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{D}_k} E(X,\phi_L) \equiv E(\phi_L) \tag{125}$$

Lemma 8. *(reblocking) For* $\kappa' \leq \frac{1}{2}L\kappa - 1$

$$\|(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}\|_{k+1,\kappa'} \leq 9K_0L^3\|E\|_{k,\kappa} \tag{126}$$

Remark. $\kappa' = \kappa$ is allowed, but κ' can also be larger than κ.

Proof. If $\bar{X}^L = LZ$ then a minimal tree on the M blocks in X is also a tree on the LM blocks in in LZ and so $Md_M(X) \geq LMd_{LM}(LZ)$. But the distance is scale invariant: $d_{LM}(LZ) = d_M(Z)$. Thus we have

$$d_M(X) \geq Ld_M(Z) \qquad \bar{X}^L = LZ \tag{127}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}(Z)\|_{k+1} \leq & \sum_{\bar{X}^L = LZ} \|E(X)\|_k \leq \|E\|_{k,\kappa} \sum_{\bar{X}^L = LZ} e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \\ \leq & \|E\|_{k,\kappa} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\kappa L d_M(Z)} \sum_{\bar{X}^L = LZ} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\kappa d_M(X)} \end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

If $\bar{X}^L = LZ$ there must be an M-cube $\square$ so $\square \subset X \subset LZ$. Using this and $\frac{1}{2}\kappa \geq \kappa_0$ and (119) yields

$$\sum_{X:\bar{X}^L = LZ} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\kappa d_M(X)} \leq \sum_{\square \subset LZ} \sum_{X \supset \square} e^{-\kappa_0 d_M(X)} \leq |LZ|_M \sum_{X \supset \square} e^{-\kappa_0 d_M(X)} \leq K_0L^3|Z|_M \tag{129}$$

But by (117) $|Z|_M \leq 9(1 + d_M(Z)) \leq 9e^{d_M(Z)}$ so we have

$$\|(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}(Z)\|_{k+1} \leq 9K_0L^3\|E\|_{k,\kappa} e^{-(\frac{1}{2}\kappa L - 1)d_M(Z)} \tag{130}$$

Since $\frac{1}{2}L\kappa - 1 \geq \kappa'$ this gives the result.

Remark. Here is a sharper version of this bound, which we will also need. Since $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ implies $\phi_L \subset L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$, we can take the supremum over this smaller set insead of $\mathcal{R}_k$. If we also reverse the roles of κ, κ' then for $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{2}L\kappa' - 1$

$$\|(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}\|_{k+1,\kappa} \leq 9K_0L^3 \sup_{X \in \mathcal{D}_k, \phi \in L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k} |E(X,\phi)| e^{\kappa' d_M(X)} \tag{131}$$

3.5 normalization

The previous estimate has a growth factor $\mathcal{O}(1)L^3$. We can cancel some or all of this if we remove relevant terms from E. Such a functional will be called normalized. We give a definition appropriate for our model.

The functional $E \in \mathcal{K}_k$ is said to be *normalized* if [3]

$$\begin{aligned} E(X,0) =&0 \\ E_2(X,0;1,1) =&0 \\ E_2(X,0;1,x_\mu) =&0 \end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

Here the derivatives can be evaluated by

$$E_n(X,\phi;f_1,\dots,f_n) = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial t_1 \cdots \partial t_n} E_n(X,\phi + t_1 f_1 + \cdots + t_n f_n)|_{t_i=0} \tag{133}$$

Note that all odd derivatives at zero vanish. This is due to our assumption that $E(X,\phi)$ is even in ϕ.

It is convenient to make a distinction between *small polymers* X which have $d_M(X) < L$ and *large polymers* which have $d_M(X) \geq L$. (A similar distinction was first exploited in [27]). We generally only require normalization for small polymers. The set of all small polymers is denoted $\mathcal{S}$ and the large polymers are denoted $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$

Now define

$$\mathcal{K}_k^{norm} = \{E \in \mathcal{K}_k : E(X,\phi) \text{ is normalized for small } X\} \tag{134}$$

This is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{K}_k$. We also need the real closed subspace $\text{Re}(\mathcal{K}_k^{norm}) = \mathcal{K}_k^{norm} \cap \text{Re}(\mathcal{K}_k)$.

Then we have the following improvement of (135).

Lemma 9. *Let $E \in \mathcal{K}_k^{norm}$. Then for L sufficiently large and λ_k sufficiently small (depending on L, M)*

$$\|(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}}\|_{k+1,\kappa} \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^{-\epsilon}\|E\|_{k,\kappa} \tag{135}$$

Proof. Let $1_{\mathcal{S}}, 1_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}$ be the characteristic functions of small polymers and large polymers. We write $(\mathcal{B}E)_{L^{-1}} = (\mathcal{B}1_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}E)_{L^{-1}} + (\mathcal{B}1_{\mathcal{S}}E)_{L^{-1}}$.

For the large set term we follow the proof of the previous lemma. If X is large then $\kappa d_M(X) \geq d_M(X) \geq L$ so we have instead of (129)

$$\sum_{X \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}: \bar{X}^L = LZ} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\kappa d_M(X)} \leq e^{-L/4} \sum_{\bar{X}^L = LZ} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\kappa d_M(X)} \leq e^{-L/4} K_0 L^3 |Z|_M \tag{136}$$

provided $\kappa/4 \geq \kappa_0$. Since $e^{-L/4}9K_0L^3 = \mathcal{O}(L^{-n})$ for any integer n we get

$$\|(\mathcal{B}1_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}E)_{L^{-1}}\|_{k+1,\kappa} \leq \mathcal{O}(L^{-n})\|E\|_{k,\kappa} \tag{137}$$

Now consider the contribution of small polymers which is

$$(\mathcal{B}1_{\mathcal{S}}E)_{L^{-1}}(Z,\phi) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{S}: \bar{X}^L = LZ} E(X,\phi_L) \tag{138}$$

We will show that for $X \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ we have

$$\|E(X,\phi_L)\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^{-3-\epsilon}\|E(X)\|_k \tag{139}$$

Then we follow the proof of the lemma 8. The L^{-3} here cancels the L^3 in that bound to leave $\mathcal{O}(L^{-\epsilon})$.

---

[3] 1 means the function $x \to 1$ and x_μ means the projection $x \to x_\mu$

We make a Taylor expansion of $E(X,\phi_L)$ in the field. At $\phi_L=0$ we get zero by the normalization condition. Also odd derivatives vanish since the functional is even in ϕ_L. Therefore

$$E(X,\phi_L)=\frac{1}{2}E_2(X,0;\phi_L,\phi_L)+\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{|t|=\frac{1}{2}L^{3/4+3\epsilon}}\frac{E(X,t\phi_L)}{t^4(t-1)}dt \tag{140}$$

Note that since $\phi_L\in L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$ on the circle $|t|=\frac{1}{2}L^{3/4+3\epsilon}$ we have $t\phi_L\in\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_k$. It follows that the second term in (140) is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)L^{-3-12\epsilon}\|E(X)\|_k$ which suffices.

For the first term in (140) we we pick a point $x_0\in X$ and insert into $E_2(X,0;\phi_L,\phi_L)$ the expansion

$$\phi_L(x)=\phi_L(x_0)+(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0)+\Delta_{\phi_L}(x,x_0) \tag{141}$$

where

$$\Delta_{\phi_L}(x,x_0)=\int_{x_0}^{x}(\partial\phi_L(y)-\partial\phi_L(x_0))\cdot dy \tag{142}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}E_2(X,0;\phi_L,\phi_L)=&E_2(X,0;\phi_L(x_0),\phi_L(x_0))\\&+2E_2(X,0;\phi_L(x_0),(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0))\\&+E_2(X,0;(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0),(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0))\\&+2E_2(X,0;(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0),\Delta_{\phi_L})\\&+E_2(X,0;\Delta_{\phi_L},\Delta_{\phi_L})\\&+2E_2(X,0;\phi_L(x_0),\Delta_{\phi_L})\end{aligned} \tag{143}$$

The first and second terms vanish due to our normalization conditions.

The remaining terms will be estimated by Cauchy inequalities. In general if $f_1\in a_1\mathcal{R}_k, f_2\in a_2\mathcal{R}_k$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned}E_2(X,0;f_1,f_2)=&\frac{\partial}{\partial t_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial t_2}\Big[E(X,t_1f_1+t_2f_2)\Big]_{t_1=t_2=0}\\=&\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{|t_1|=(2a_1)^{-1},|t_2|=(2a_2)^{-1}}\frac{dt_1}{t_1^2}\frac{dt_1}{t_1^2}E(X,t_1f_1+t_2f_2)\end{aligned} \tag{144}$$

This gives the estimate

$$|E_2(X,0;f_1,f_2)|\leq\mathcal{O}(1)a_1a_2\|E(X)\|_k \tag{145}$$

Now we claim that if $\phi\in\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ and $x,x_0\in X$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_L(x_0)&\in L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k\\(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0)&\in L^{-7/4-2\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k\\\Delta_{\phi_L}&\in L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k\end{aligned} \tag{146}$$

Then the third term in (143) has a factor $L^{-7/2-4\epsilon}$, the fourth term has a factor $L^{-7/2-\alpha-3\epsilon}$, the fifth term has a factor $L^{-7/2-2\alpha-2\epsilon}$, and the sixth term has a factor $L^{-5/2-\alpha-\epsilon}$. This easily gives the required

$$|E_2(X,0;\phi_L,\phi_L)|\leq\mathcal{O}(1)L^{-3-\epsilon}\|E(X)\|_k \tag{147}$$

For the first inclusion in (146) we already have by (121), $|\phi_L(x_0)|\leq L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon}$. The derivatives vanish so this establishes $\phi_L(x_0)\in L^{-3/4-\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$.

For the second inclusion in (146) note that if X is small then $|X|_M \leq 9(d_M(X)+1) \leq 9(L+1)$ so the largest distance between points in X is $9M(L+1)$. Then we estimate by (121) for λ_k sufficiently small

$$\begin{aligned} |(x-x_0)\cdot \partial\phi_L(x_0)| \leq & 9M(L+1)L^{-7/4-2\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-2\epsilon} \\ \leq & (9M(L+1)\lambda_k^{\epsilon})L^{-7/4-2\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} \leq L^{-7/4-2\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} \end{aligned} \tag{148}$$

Furthermore the derivative is the constant

$$\left|\partial\Big[(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0)\Big]\right| = |\partial\phi_L(x_0)| \leq L^{-7/4-2\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-2\epsilon} \tag{149}$$

The difference of derivatives is zero, so $(x-x_0)\cdot\partial\phi_L(x_0) \in L^{-7/4-2\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$.

For the third inclusion in (146) we estimate by (121)

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_{\phi_L}(x)| =& |\int_{x_0}^{x}(\partial\phi_L(y)-\partial\phi_L(x_0))\cdot dy| \\ \leq & L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon}\int_{x_0}^{x} d(y,x_0)^{\alpha}|dy| \\ \leq & L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon}(9M(L+1))^{1+\alpha} \\ \leq & L^{-7/4-\alpha}\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} \end{aligned} \tag{150}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial\Delta_{\phi_L}(x)| =& |\partial\phi_L(x)-\partial\phi_L(x_0)| \\ \leq & L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon}d(x,x_0)^{\alpha} \\ \leq & L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon}(9M(L+1))^{\alpha} \\ \leq & L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-2\epsilon} \end{aligned} \tag{151}$$

Similarly

$$|\partial\Delta_{\phi_L}(x)-\partial\Delta_{\phi_L}(y)| = |\partial\phi_L(x)-\partial\phi_L(y)| \leq L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-\epsilon}d(x,y)^{\alpha} \tag{152}$$

The last three bounds imply $\Delta_{\phi_L} \in L^{-7/4-\alpha-\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$. This completes the demonstration of (146) and the proof of the theorem.

We also explain how to arrange the normalization for small polymers. Given $E \in \mathcal{K}_k$ we define $\mathcal{R}E \in \mathcal{K}_k$ as follows. If X is small then $\mathcal{R}E(X)$ is defined by

$$E(X,\phi) = E(X,0) + \frac{1}{2}\frac{E_2(X,0;1,1)}{\mathrm{Vol}(X)}\int_X \phi^2 + \sum_{\mu}\frac{E_2(X,0;1,x_\mu - x_{0,\mu})}{\mathrm{Vol}(X)}\int_X \phi\,\partial_\mu\phi + \mathcal{R}E(X,\phi) \tag{153}$$

where $x_0 \in X$ is a choice of some standard point in X, taken to respect the lattice symmetries. If X is large then $\mathcal{R}E(X) = E(X)$. Then it is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{R}E$ is normalized for small polymers

Lemma 10. *For $E \in \mathcal{K}_k$ and λ_k sufficiently small*

$$\|\mathcal{R}E(X)\|_k \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|E(X)\|_k \tag{154}$$

Proof. It suffices to check for small polymers X. We check that every other term in (153) satisfies such a bound. This is immediate for $E(X,\phi)$ and $E(X,0)$.

For the next term note that since $1 \in \lambda_k^{1/4+3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$ we have by (145)

$$|E_2(X,0;1,1)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/2+6\epsilon}\|E(X)\|_k \tag{155}$$

Thus for $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_k$

$$\Big|\frac{E_2(X,0;1,1)}{\mathrm{Vol}(X)}\int_X \phi^2\Big| \leq \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/2+6\epsilon}\|E(X)\|_k}{\mathrm{Vol}(X)}\mathrm{Vol}(X)\lambda_k^{-1/2-6\epsilon} \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|E(X)\|_k \tag{156}$$

For the next term note that

$$\begin{aligned} |x_\mu - x_{0,\mu}| &\leq 9M(L+1) \leq \ (9M(L+1)\lambda_k^{\epsilon})\lambda_k^{1/4+2\epsilon}\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} \leq [\lambda_k^{1/4+2\epsilon}]\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} \\ |\partial_\nu(x_\mu - x_{0,\mu})| &\leq 1 \leq [\lambda_k^{1/4+2\epsilon}]\lambda_k^{-1/4-2\epsilon} \end{aligned} \tag{157}$$

Therefore $x_\mu - x_{0,\mu} \in \lambda_k^{1/4+2\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$ and so

$$|E_2(Y,0;1,x_\mu - x_{0,\mu})| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/2+5\epsilon}\|E(X)\|_k \tag{158}$$

It follows that for $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_k$

$$\Big|\sum_\mu \frac{E_2(X,0;1,x_\mu - x_{0,\mu})}{\mathrm{Vol}(X)}\int_X \phi\ \partial_\mu\phi\Big| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|E(X)\|_k \tag{159}$$

This completes the proof

Inserting (153) into $E = \sum_X E(X)$ and defining $\mathcal{R}E = \sum_X \mathcal{R}E(X)$ we find we have extracted energy and mass terms:

$$E = -\varepsilon(E)\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}) - \frac{1}{2}\mu(E)\|\phi\|^2 + \mathcal{R}E \tag{160}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(E) &= -\sum_{X\supset\Box, X\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}(X)}E(X,0) \\ \mu(E) &= -\sum_{X\supset\Box, X\in\mathcal{S}} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}(X)}E_2(X,0;1,1) \end{aligned} \tag{161}$$

are independent of $\Box$ by translation invariance. We have also used that the lattice symmetries imply

$$\sum_{X\supset\Box, X\in\mathcal{S}} E_2(X,0;1,x_\mu) = 0 \tag{162}$$

Lemma 11.

$$\begin{aligned} |\varepsilon(E)| &\leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|E\|_{k,\kappa} \\ |\mu(E)| &\leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/2+6\epsilon}\|E\|_{k,\kappa} \end{aligned} \tag{163}$$

Proof. For the first bound we have $\varepsilon(E) \leq \sum_{X\supset\Box}\|E(X)\|_k \leq K_0\|E\|_{k,\kappa}$ as in (119). The second bound uses (155) and follows in the same way.

4 The RG transformation with small fields

4.1 the theorem

Now we study the RG transformation with the potential, but modified with a small field assumption. The starting point is still the density

$$\rho_0(\Phi_0) = \exp\Big(- S_0(\Phi_0) - V_0(\Phi_0)\Big) \tag{164}$$

where $\Phi_0 : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} S_0(\Phi_0) =& \frac{1}{2}\|\partial\Phi_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mu}_0\|\Phi_0\|^2 \\ V_0(\Phi_0) =& \varepsilon_0 \mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_0\|\Phi_0\|^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_0 \sum_x \Phi_0(x)^4 \end{aligned} \tag{165}$$

But now instead of (26) we add some characteristic functions and define ρ_k recursively as follows. For $\Phi_k : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi^0_{k+1} : \mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ let

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) \\ =& \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}} \int \exp\Big(-\frac{a}{2L^2}\|\Phi^0_{k+1} - Q\Phi_k\|^2\Big)\, \chi^W_k\Big(C_k^{-1/2}(\Phi_k - \Psi_k)\Big)\chi_k(\Phi_k)\rho_k(\Phi_k)\ \ d\Phi_k \end{aligned} \tag{166}$$

and as before for $\Phi_{k+1} : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k-1} \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) = \tilde{\rho}_k(\Phi_{k+1,L}) L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}|/2} \tag{167}$$

Here the characterstic functions are

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^W_k(W) =& \chi(|W| \leq p_{0,k}) \\ \chi_k(\Phi_k) =& \chi(\Phi_k \in \mathcal{S}_k) \end{aligned} \tag{168}$$

With the free minimizer $\Psi_k = \Psi_k(\Phi^0_{k+1})$ defined in (48) the function $\chi^W_k\Big(C_k^{-1/2}(\Phi_k - \Psi_k)\Big)$ enforces that the fluctuation field $\Phi_k - \Psi_k$ be small. The size is determined by

$$p_{0,k} = p_0(\lambda_k) = (-\log\lambda_k)^{p_0} \tag{169}$$

This has the same form as p_k but with a smaller integer exponent $p_0 < p$. The function $\chi_k(\Phi_k)$ is the small field restrtiction. Actually we only consider $\Phi_{k+1} \in S_{k+1}$ in which case this restriction is unnecessary as we will see.

The characteristic functions spoil the preservation of integrals enjoyed in (28), and so the densities ρ_k as defined here have no intrinsic interest. However the tools and estimates we develop in their analysis will be invaluable when we drop the characteristic functions in the next paper.

We are going to assert that after k steps the density can be written in the following local form. For $\Phi_k \in S_k$

$$\rho_k(\Phi_k) = Z_k \exp\Big(- S_k(\Phi_k,\phi_k) - V_k(\phi_k) + E_k(\phi_k)\Big) \tag{170}$$

where $\phi_k : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\phi_k = a_k G_k Q_k^T \Phi_k$ and

$$\begin{aligned} S_k(\Phi_k,\phi_k) =& \frac{1}{2}a_k\|\Phi_k - Q_k\phi_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\partial\phi_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mu}_k\|\phi_k\|^2 \\ V_k(\phi_k) =& \varepsilon_k \mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_k\|\phi_k\|^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_k \int \phi^4_k(x)dx \end{aligned} \tag{171}$$

We further assert that the functional $E_k(\phi)$ is defined and analytic in the larger set $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_k$ and can be written

$$E_k(\phi) = \sum_X E_k(X,\phi) \tag{172}$$

where $E_k(X,\phi) \in \mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{K}_k^{norm})$ and so is normalized for small polymers.

Theorem 12. *Let L, M be sufficiently large, let λ_k be sufficiently small (depending on L, M). Suppose $\rho_k(\Phi_k)$ has the representation (170)- (172) for*

$$|\mu_k| \leq \lambda_k^{1/2} \qquad \|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \leq 1 \tag{173}$$

Then $\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1})$ has a representation of the same form for $\Phi_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{k+1}$. The bounds are not the same but we do have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{k+1} =& L^3\varepsilon_k + \mathcal{L}_1 E_k + \varepsilon_k^*(\lambda_k,\mu_k,E_k) \\ \mu_{k+1} =& L^2\mu_k + \mathcal{L}_2 E_k + \mu_k^*(\lambda_k,\mu_k,E_k) \\ \lambda_{k+1} =& L\lambda_k \\ E_{k+1} =& \mathcal{L}_3 E_k + E_k^*(\lambda_k,\mu_k,E_k) \end{aligned} \tag{174}$$

where the $\mathcal{L}_i$ are linear operators which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}_1 E_k| \leq& \mathcal{O}(1)L^{-\epsilon}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \\ |\mathcal{L}_2 E_k| \leq& \mathcal{O}(1)L^{-\epsilon}\lambda_k^{1/2+6\epsilon}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \\ \|\mathcal{L}_3 E_k\|_{k+1,\kappa} \leq& \mathcal{O}(1)L^{-\epsilon}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \end{aligned} \tag{175}$$

and where

$$|\varepsilon_k^*| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \qquad |\mu_k^*| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon} \qquad \|E_k^*\|_{k+1,\kappa} \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \tag{176}$$

Remarks. The unstarred terms represent scalings and rearrangements of the existing terms, but not the effects of the fluctuation integral. The starred terms are the effect of the fluctuation integral. We are not writing the RG transformation as linear plus higher order here. The starred terms include some linear terms and are not necessarily smaller the the unstarred terms, although they do have better bounds.

This flow shows strong growth, but it is tolerable due to the ultraviolet origin of the problem: we start with very small coupling constants. Our concern will be that the growth is not too rapid. We want to finish at a good place.

The main idea is that we have removed mass and energy terms from E_k by normalizing, and included them in corrections to ε_k, μ_k. These are the fastest growing terms and in this form they will be susceptible to analysis.

4.2 start of the proof

We want to study $\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1})$ for $\Phi_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{k+1}$. Thus we want to study $\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1})$ for $\Phi^0_{k+1,L^{-1}} \in \mathcal{S}_{k+1}$. Taking into account that $\phi^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) = [\phi_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1,L^{-1}})]_L$ this implies $\Phi^0_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}^0_{k+1}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^0_{k+1} - Q_k\phi^0_{k+1}| \leq& L^{-1/2}p_{k+1} \\ |\partial\phi^0_{k+1}| \leq& L^{-3/2}p_{k+1} \\ |\phi^0_{k+1}| \leq& L^{-1/2}\lambda_{k+1}^{-1/4}p_{k+1} \end{aligned} \tag{177}$$

Furthermore since $\phi_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1,L^{-1}}) \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ by lemma 6 we deduce by lemma 7 that $\phi^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) \in L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$.

Now for $\Phi^0_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}^0_{k+1}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) =& Z_k\ \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}} \int \exp\Big(-\frac{a}{2L^2}\|\Phi^0_{k+1}-Q\Phi_k\|^2 - S_k(\Phi_k,\phi_k) - V_k(\phi_k) + E_k(\phi_k)\Big) \\ & \chi^W_k\Big(C_k^{-1/2}(\Phi_k-\Psi_k)\Big)\chi_k(\Phi_k)\ d\Phi_k\end{aligned} \tag{178}$$

We expand in Φ_k around the miniminzer Ψ_k for the first two terms $a/2L^2\|\Phi^0_{k+1}-Q\Phi_k\|^2 + S_k(\Phi_k,\phi_k)$ by writing $\Phi_k = \Psi_k + Z$. As in (68) this generates $S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1},\phi^0_{k+1}) + \frac{1}{2}\Big\langle Z, (\Delta_k + aL^{-2}Q^TQ)Z\Big\rangle$. We also have $\phi_k(\Psi_k+Z) = \phi^0_{k+1} + \mathcal{Z}_k$ where $\mathcal{Z}_k = a_kG_kQ^TZ$ as in (66). Changing the integration variable from Φ_k to Z yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) = Z_k\ \mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{N+M}-k}} \exp\Big(-S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1},\phi^0_{k+1})\Big) \\ &\int \exp\Big(E^+_k(\phi^0_{k+1}+\mathcal{Z}_k) - \frac{1}{2} < Z, (\Delta_k + \frac{a}{L^2}Q^TQ)Z > \Big)\chi_k(\Psi_k+Z)\chi^W_k\Big(C_k^{-1/2}Z)\Big)\ dZ\end{aligned} \tag{179}$$

Here we have introduced

$$E^+_k(\phi) = E_k(\phi) - V_k(\phi) \tag{180}$$

If we define

$$V_k(\square,\phi) = \varepsilon_k \mathrm{Vol}(\square) + \frac{1}{2}\mu_k\|\phi\|^2_{\square} + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_k\int_{\square}\phi^4_k(x)dx \tag{181}$$

then $V_k(\phi) = \sum_{\square} V_k(\square,\phi)$. If we also define $V_k(X,\phi) = 0$ for $|X|_M \geq 2$ then $V_k(\phi) = \sum_X V_k(X,\phi)$. Together with (172) this gives a local expansion

$$E^+_k(\phi) = \sum_X\ E^+_k(X,\phi) \tag{182}$$

Recall also that $C_k = \big(\Delta_k + aL^{-2}Q^TQ\big)^{-1}$ and let μ_{C_k} be the Gaussian measure with covariance C_k. Then (179) can be written

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}) = Z_k\mathcal{N}^{-1}_{aL,\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}}(2\pi)^{|\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2}(\det C_k)^{1/2}\exp\Big(-S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1},\phi^0_{k+1})\Big) \\ &\int \exp\Big(E^+_k(\phi^0_{k+1}+\mathcal{Z}_k)\Big)\chi_k(\Psi_k+Z)\chi^W_k(C_k^{-1/2}Z)\ d\mu_{C_k}(Z)\end{aligned} \tag{183}$$

If we multiply by $L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2}$ we can identify the constant in front as Z_{k+1} by (65). We make one further adjustment in the integral by changing from Gaussian $Z : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ with covariance C_k to $Z = C_k^{1/2}W$ where Gaussian $W : \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ has identity covariance. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1})L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M+N}-k}|/2} = Z_{k+1}\exp\Big(-S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1},\phi^0_{k+1})\Big) \\ &\int \exp\Big(E^+_k(\phi^0_{k+1}+\mathcal{W}_k)\Big)\chi_k(\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W)\ \chi^W_k(W)d\mu_I(W)\end{aligned} \tag{184}$$

where $\mathcal{W}_k : \mathbb{T}^{-k}_{\mathsf{M+N}-k} \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{W}_k = \phi_k(C_k^{1/2}W) = a_kG_kQ_k^TC_k^{1/2}W \tag{185}$$

The next lemma shows that we can drop $\chi_k(\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W)$ from this expression.

Lemma 13. *For $\Phi^0_{k+1} \in \mathcal{S}^0_{k+1}$ and $|W| \leq p_{0,k}$ we have $\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W \in \mathcal{S}_k$ and hence*

$$\chi_k(\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W) = 1 \tag{186}$$

Proof. We must show

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W - Q_k\phi_k(\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W)| &\leq p_k \\ |\partial\phi_k(\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W)| &\leq p_k \\ |\phi_k(\Psi_k + C_k^{1/2}W))| &\leq \lambda_k^{-1/4}\ p_k \end{aligned} \tag{187}$$

We give separate bounds on the terms involving Ψ_k and W.

For the Ψ_k terms we identify $\phi_k(\Psi_k) = \phi^0_{k+1}$ and show

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_k - Q_k\phi^0_{k+1}| &\leq \frac{1}{2}p_k \\ |\partial\phi^0_{k+1}| &\leq \frac{1}{2}p_k \\ |\phi^0_{k+1}| &\leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_k^{-1/4}p_k \end{aligned} \tag{188}$$

These follow from (177). The last follows from $|\phi^0_{k+1}| \leq L^{-1/2}\lambda_{k+1}^{-1/4}p_{k+1} \leq L^{-3/4}\lambda_k^{-1/4}p_k$. The second follows by $|\partial\phi^0_{k+1}| \leq L^{-3/2}p_{k+1} \leq L^{-3/2}p_k$. The first follows by

$$|\Psi_k - Q_k\phi^0_{k+1}| \leq |Q^T\Big(\Phi^0_{k+1} - Q_{k+1}\phi^0_{k+1}\Big)| \leq \|\Phi^0_{k+1} - Q_{k+1}\phi^0_{k+1}\|_\infty \leq L^{-1/2}p_{k+1} \leq L^{-1/2}p_k \tag{189}$$

Here we have used the explicit expression (48) for Ψ_k.

For the W terms we neeed

$$\begin{aligned} |C_k^{1/2}W - Q_k\mathcal{W}_k| &\leq \frac{1}{2}p_k \\ |\partial\mathcal{W}_k| &\leq \frac{1}{2}p_k \\ |\mathcal{W}_k| &\leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_k^{-1/4}p_k \end{aligned} \tag{190}$$

In the next lemma we show that $|C_k^{1/2}W|, |\mathcal{W}_k|, |\partial\mathcal{W}_k|$ are all bounded by a constant times $p_{0,k}$ Then if λ_k is sufficiently small we have $p_{0,k}/p_k = (-\log\lambda_k)^{p_0-p}$ as small as we like since $p_0 < p$. Hence these functions are bounded by say $\frac{1}{4}p_k$ which suffices to prove (190). This completes the proof.

Lemma 14. *If $|W| \leq p_{0,k}$ then*

$$|C_k^{1/2}W|, |\mathcal{W}_k|, |\partial\mathcal{W}_k|, |\delta_\alpha\partial\mathcal{W}_k| \leq \textit{const}\ p_{0,k} \tag{191}$$

where the constant depends on L. Furthermore $\mathcal{W}_k \in \lambda_k^{1/4}\mathcal{R}_k$

Proof. For $\lambda > 0$

$$\lambda^{-1/2} = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{\sqrt{x}}(\lambda + x)^{-1} \tag{192}$$

Hence we have the operator identity.

$$\begin{aligned} C_k^{1/2} =&\frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^{\infty}\frac{dx}{\sqrt{x}}C_{k,x} \\ C_{k,x} =&\Big(\Delta_k + \frac{a}{L^2}Q^TQ + x\Big)^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{193}$$

In appendix C we establish

$$C_{k,x} = A_{k,x} + a_k^2 A_{k,x} Q_k G_{k,x} Q_k^T A_{k,x} \tag{194}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,x} =&\frac{1}{a_k + x}(I - Q^TQ) + \frac{1}{a_k + aL^{-2} + x}Q^TQ \\ G_{k,x} =&\Big(- \Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k - a_k^2 Q_k^T A_{k,x} Q_k\Big)^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{195}$$

An alternate expression for $G_{k,x}$ (see (327)) shows that we are inverting a positive operator. Furthermore one can show that $G_{k,x}$ satisfies $|G_{k,x}W| \leq \mathrm{const}\|W\|_{\infty}$ just as for G_k, although now the constant depends on L. Also $|A_{k.x}W| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)(1+x)^{-1}\|W\|_{\infty}$. Hence $|C_{k.x}W| \leq \mathrm{const}(1+x)^{-1}\|W\|_{\infty}$ and $|C_k^{1/2}W| \leq \mathrm{const}\|W\|_{\infty} \leq \mathrm{const}\ p_{0,k}$. The other bounds follow by (95). For example

$$|\mathcal{W}_k| = |a_k G_k Q_k^T C_k^{1/2} W| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\|C_k^{1/2}W\|_{\infty} \leq \mathrm{const}\ p_{0,k} \leq p_k \leq \lambda_k^{-\epsilon} \leq \lambda_k^{-3\epsilon} \tag{196}$$

The last bound is the one needed for $\mathcal{W}_k \in \lambda_k^{1/4}\mathcal{R}_k$. The bounds on $\partial\mathcal{W}_k$ and $\delta_\alpha\partial\mathcal{W}_k$ are similar.

4.3 fluctuation integral

With the characteristic function gone we now have

$$\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1})L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}|/2} = Z_{k+1}\ \exp\Big(- S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \phi^0_{k+1})\Big)\Xi_k(\phi^0_{k+1}) \tag{197}$$

where

$$\Xi_k(\phi) = \int \exp\Big(E_k^+(\phi + \mathcal{W}_k)\Big)\ \chi_k^W(W) d\mu_I(W) \tag{198}$$

This is the fluctuation integral. We are going to study it for $\phi \in \frac12\mathcal{R}_k$. It is well defined with this restriction since E^+ is defined on $\mathcal{R}_k$ and $\mathcal{W}_k \in \lambda_k^{1/4}\mathcal{R}_k \subset \frac12\mathcal{R}_k$. Note also that the point of interest $\phi^0_{k+1} \in L^{-3/4-3\epsilon}\mathcal{R}_k$ is included in $\frac12\mathcal{R}_k$.

We make a couple of adjustments in Ξ_k. First change to the probability measure

$$d\mu_k^*(W) = \mathcal{N}_{\chi,k}^{-1}\ \chi_k^W(W) d\mu_I(W) \tag{199}$$

Here the normalizing factor is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{\chi,k} =&\int \chi_k^W(W) d\mu_I(W) \\ =&\prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}} \int \chi_k^W(W(x)) d\mu_I(W(x)) \\ =&\prod_{x \in \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}} \exp(-\varepsilon_k^0) = \exp\Big(- \varepsilon_k^0 \mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k})\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{200}$$

where $\varepsilon_k^0 > 0$ is defined by

$$\varepsilon_k^0 = -\log\Big(\int \chi_k^W(W(x)) d\mu_I(W(x))\Big) \tag{201}$$

It is straightforward to show

$$|\int \chi_k^W(W(x))d\mu_I(W(x)) - 1| \leq \mathcal{O}(e^{-p_{0,k}^2/2}) \tag{202}$$

and hence $\varepsilon_k^0 \leq \mathcal{O}(e^{-p_{0,k}^2/2})$ as well. It is very small

Secondly define $\delta E_k^+(\phi, \mathcal{W}_k)$ by

$$E_k^+(\phi + \mathcal{W}_k) = E_k^+(\phi) + \delta E_k^+(\phi, \mathcal{W}_k) \tag{203}$$

There is also a local decomposition inherited from E_k^+. The term $E_k^+(\phi)$ is pulled out of the integral. It is not necessarily small and would make subsequent estimates awkward.

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_k(\phi) =& \exp\Big(- \varepsilon_k^0 \mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}) + E_k^+(\phi)\Big)\Xi_k'(\phi)\\ \Xi_k'(\phi) =& \int \exp\Big(\delta E_k^+(\phi, \mathcal{W}_k)\Big) d\mu_k^*(W)\end{aligned} \tag{204}$$

To analyze $\Xi_k'(\phi)$ we start with a general bound on the local pieces $\delta E_k^+(X, \phi, \mathcal{W}_k)$ which are small.

Lemma 15. *For $\phi \in \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_k$ and $|W| \leq p_{0,k}$.*

$$|\delta E_k^+(X, \phi, \mathcal{W}_k)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{205}$$

Proof. We have $\delta E_k^+ = \delta E_k - \delta V_k$ and we first consider δV_k. We have

$$\delta V_k(\Box) = \frac{1}{4}\lambda_k \int_\Box \Big[(\phi + \mathcal{W}_k)^4 - \phi^4\Big] + \frac{1}{2}\mu_k \int_\Box \Big[(\phi + \mathcal{W}_k)^2 - \phi^2\Big] \tag{206}$$

Now $|\phi| \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon}$ and $|\mathcal{W}_k| \leq p_k$ so the first term has a contribution

$$\left|2\lambda_k \int_\Box \phi^3 \mathcal{W}_k\right| \leq 2M^3 \cdot \lambda_k^{1/4-9\epsilon} p_k \leq \lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \tag{207}$$

The other contributions to the first term are smaller. Similarly the second term has a contribution

$$\left|\mu_k \int_\Box \phi \mathcal{W}_k\right| \leq \lambda_k^{1/2} M^3 \cdot \lambda_k^{-1/4-3\epsilon} p_k \leq \lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon} \tag{208}$$

The other term is smaller. Overall then $|\delta V_k(\Box)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon}$.

By lemma 14 we have $\mathcal{W}_k \in \lambda_k^{1/4}\mathcal{R}_k$. So if $|t| \leq \lambda_k^{-1/4}/4$ then $t\mathcal{W}_k \in 1/4\mathcal{R}_k$ and $\phi + t\mathcal{W}_k \subset 3/4\mathcal{R}_k$. The function $t \to E_k(\phi + t\mathcal{W}_k)$ is analytic in this domain and so

$$\delta E_k(X, \phi, \mathcal{W}_k) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{|t| = \lambda_k^{-1/4}/4} \frac{dt}{t(t-1)} E_k(X, \phi + t\mathcal{W}_k) \tag{209}$$

Since

$$|E_k(X, \phi + t\mathcal{W}_k)| \leq \|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \leq e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{210}$$

this gives the bound

$$|\delta E_k(X, \phi, \mathcal{W}_k)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4} e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{211}$$

which is sufficient.

4.4 localization

Next we localize the dependence of $\delta E^+_k(X,\phi,\mathcal{W}_k)$ in W. As explained in section 2.5 we introduce a variable $s=\{s_\square\}$ with $0\leq s_\square\leq 1$ for every M- cube $\square$. In the random walk expansion $G_k=\sum_\omega G_{k,\omega}$ we weaken the coupling through $\square$ by introducing

$$G_k(s)=\sum_\omega s_\omega G_{k,\omega} \tag{212}$$

We can also give a weakened form for $C_k^{1/2}$ as follows. We use the representation (193), (194), (195) for $C_k^{1/2}$ in terms of $G_{k,x},A_{k,x}$. Then $G_{k,x}$ has a random walk expansion $G_{k,x}=\sum_\omega G_{k,x,\omega}$ just like G_k, and hence it also has a weakened version

$$G_{k,x}(s)=\sum_\omega s_\omega G_{k,x,\omega} \tag{213}$$

The weakened form for $C_k^{1/2}$ is now

$$\begin{aligned} C_k^{1/2}(s)=&\frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty\frac{dx}{\sqrt{x}}C_{k,x}(s)\\ C_{k,x}(s)=&A_{k,x}+a_k^2A_{k,x}Q_kG_{k,x}(s)Q_k^TA_{k,x}\end{aligned} \tag{214}$$

Combining these we get a weakened form for $\mathcal{W}_k=a_kG_kQ_k^TC_k^{1/2}W$ which is

$$\mathcal{W}_k(s)\equiv a_kG_k(s)Q_k^TC_k^{1/2}(s)W \tag{215}$$

The term $\delta E^+_k(X,\phi,\mathcal{W}_k)$ is local in $\phi,\mathcal{W}_k$, but not in W because $\mathcal{W}_k$ at any point depends on W at every point. We remedy this with the following localization expansion. Break the coupling outside of X by interpolating with $\delta E^+_k(X,\phi,\mathcal{W}_k(s))$. Use the identity

$$f(s_\square=1)=f(s_\square=0)+\int_0^1 ds_\square\frac{\partial f}{\partial s_\square} \tag{216}$$

successively in each variable in $s_{X^c}=\{s_\square\}_{\square\in X^c}$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\delta E^+_k(X)=&\sum_{Y\supset X}\delta E^+_k(X,Y)\\ \delta E^+_k(X,Y;\phi,W)=&\int ds_{Y-X}\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{Y-X}}\left[\delta E^+_k(X,\phi,\mathcal{W}_k(s))\right]_{s_{Y^c}=0,s_X=1}\end{aligned} \tag{217}$$

Now we write

$$\delta E^+_k=\sum_X\delta E^+_k(X)=\sum_X\sum_{Y\supset X}\delta E^+_k(X,Y)=\sum_Y(\delta E^+_k)'(Y) \tag{218}$$

where

$$(\delta E^+_k)'(Y)=\sum_{X\subset Y}\delta E^+_k(X,Y) \tag{219}$$

Here X is connected but Y may not be. However we have:

Lemma 16. *In the expansion $\delta E^+_k=\sum_Y(\delta E^+_k)'(Y)$ we can restrict to connected Y, i.e $Y\in\mathcal{D}_k$. Furthermore $(\delta E^+_k)'(Y)=(\delta E^+_k)'(Y,\phi,W)$ only depends on ϕ,W on Y.*

Proof. Consider the random walk expansion (212) for $G_k(s)|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$ which occurs in $\mathcal{W}_k(s)|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$. If $\Box \subset Y^c$ then $s_\Box = 0$ and so then $s_\omega = 0$ for any path ω such that $X_\omega \supset \Box$. Thus in $G_k(s)|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$ paths such that X_ω intersect Y^c do not occur, and we must have $X_\omega \subset Y$. But X_ω is connected so only paths such that X_ω is in a single connected component of Y contribute. This means that $G_k(s)|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$ preserves the subspaces of functions on the various connected components of Y. The same is true of $C_k^{1/2}(s)|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$ and $\mathcal{M}_k(s))|_{s_{Y^c}=0} \equiv a_k G_k(s) Q_k^T C_k^{1/2}(s)|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$. But we are interested in $\mathcal{W}_k(s))|_{s_{Y^c}=0} = \mathcal{M}_k(s))W|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$ on X which means that only $\mathcal{M}_k(s))|_{s_{Y^c}=0}$ restricted to functions on the component of Y containing X contributes. Therefore derivatives in $\partial/\partial s_{Y-X}$ for cubes in other connected components of Y give zero. Hence in (217) we can restrict the sum over $Y \supset X$ to connected Y which proves the first statement. Furthermore we see that $\delta E_k^+(X, Y; \phi, W)$ and hence $(\delta E_k^+)'(Y, \phi, W)$ only depends on ϕ, W in Y. This completes the proof.

Lemma 17. *For $\phi \in \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_k$ and $|W| \leq p_{0,k}$*

$$|(\delta E_k^+)'(Y, \phi, W)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \exp\Big(-(\kappa - \kappa_0) d_M(Y)\Big) \tag{220}$$

Proof. For $\Box \subset Y - X$ we consider $s_\Box$ complex and satisfying $|s_\Box| \leq M^{1/2}$. As explained in section 2.5 the operator $G_k(s)$ satisfies bounds of the same form as G_k. In the same way $C_k^{1/2}(s)$ satisfies bounds of the same form as $C_k^{1/2}$. Hence $\mathcal{W}_k(s)$ satisfies bounds on the same form as $\mathcal{W}_k$. Therefore $\delta E_k^+(X, \phi, \mathcal{W}_k(s))$ is analytic in $|s_\Box| \leq M^{1/2}$ and satisfies there

$$|\delta E_k^+(X, \phi, \mathcal{W}_k(s))| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{221}$$

just as in lemma 15. If we let $\kappa_1 = \frac{1}{2}\log M$ we can write the condition as $|s_\Box| \leq e^{\kappa_1}$. Now if we restrict to $|s_\Box| \leq 1$ we get Cauchy bounds on the derivatives:

$$\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{Y-X}}\left[\delta E_k^+(X, \phi, \mathcal{W}_k(s))\right]\Big| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-(\kappa_1 - 1)|Y-X|_M} \lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{222}$$

We can assume $\kappa_1 - 1 \geq \kappa$. Using this, integrating over s_{Y-X} and summing over $X \subset Y$ yields

$$|(\delta E_k^+)'(Y, \phi, W)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \sum_{X \subset Y} \exp\Big(-\kappa|Y - X|_M - \kappa d_M(X)\Big) \tag{223}$$

We show below that $d_M(Y) \leq |Y - X|_M + d_M(X)$. A factor $\exp(-(\kappa - \kappa_0)d_M(Y))$ can then be extracted from the sum (223). Then to complete the proof we need

$$\sum_{X \subset Y} \exp\Big(-\kappa_0|Y - X|_M - \kappa_0 d_M(X)\Big) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{224}$$

Break the sum over X into sums with $|X|_M \leq \frac{1}{2}|Y|_M$ and the complement. If $|X|_M \leq \frac{1}{2}|Y|_M$ then $|Y|_M \leq |Y - X|_M + \frac{1}{2}|Y|_M$ and hence $\frac{1}{2}|Y|_M \leq |Y - X|_M$. Therefore this part of the sum is bounded by

$$\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\kappa_0|Y|_M\Big) \sum_{X \subset Y} \exp\Big(-\kappa_0 d_M(X)\Big) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\kappa_0|Y|_M\Big)|Y|_M \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{225}$$

Here we have used corollary 24 in the appendix. If $|X|_M \geq \frac{1}{2}|Y|_M$ then $d_M(X) \geq \frac{1}{9}|X|_M - 1 \geq \frac{1}{18}|Y|_M - 1$ and so this part of the sum is bounded by

$$\exp\Big(-\kappa_0(-\frac{1}{18}|Y|_M + 1)\Big) \sum_{X \subset Y} \exp\Big(\kappa_0|Y - X|_M\Big) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \exp\Big(\kappa_0(-\frac{1}{18}|Y|_M + 1)\Big)|Y|_M \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{226}$$

Again we have used corollary 24 in the appendix.

Lemma 18. *For $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_k$ and $X \subset Y$:*

$$Md_M(Y) \leq M|Y - X|_M + Md_M(X) \tag{227}$$

Proof. Let τ be a minimal tree on the M-cubes in X of length $Md_M(X)$. Let $(Y-X)_i$, be the connected components of $Y - X$. Every component $(Y - X)_i$ has a cube $\square_i$ adjacent to a cube in $\square_i' \subset X$ across a 2-dimensional face. Let x_i' be the point in $\square_i'$ which is a vertex of τ. Now extend the tree τ by taking a line from x_i' to the translated point x_i in $\square_i$. Then extend it to all of $(Y - X)_i$ by taking lines across two dimensional faces joining translates of x_i. For each i this adds a length $M|(Y - X)_i|_M$. Thus we have constructed a tree joining all the blocks of Y of length $Md_M(X) + \sum_i M|(Y-X)_i|_M = Md_M(X) + M|Y - X|_M$. This must be greater than the length of a minimal tree $Md_M(Y)$.

4.5 cluster expansion

The modified fluctuation integral is now

$$\Xi_k'(\phi) = \int \exp\Big(\sum_X (\delta E_k^+)'(X, \phi, W)\Big) d\mu_k^*(W) \tag{228}$$

The cluster expansion gives this a local structure. The result is:

Lemma 19. *(cluster expansion) Let λ_k be sufficiently small. For $\phi \in \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}_k$*

$$\Xi_k'(\phi) = \exp\Big(\sum_Y \ E_k^{\#}(Y, \phi)\Big) \tag{229}$$

where

$$|E_k^{\#}(Y, \phi)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4 - 10\epsilon} \exp\big(-\big(\kappa - 4\kappa_0 - 3\big)d_M(Y)\big) \tag{230}$$

For the standard proof see appendix B. The bound (230) follows from the bound (220). The latter is small enough to fall within the range of validity of the cluster expansion if $\mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \leq c_0$.

Inserting this result into (204) and defining $E^{\#}(\phi) = \sum_Y E^{\#}(Y, \phi)$ we have

$$\Xi_k(\phi) = \exp\Big(- \varepsilon_k^0 \text{Vol}(\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}) + E_k^+(\phi) + \ E_k^{\#}(\phi)\Big) \tag{231}$$

Insert this into (197) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\rho}_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1})L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}|/2} \\ =&Z_{k+1} \ \exp\Big(- S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \phi^0_{k+1}) - \varepsilon_k^0 \text{Vol}(\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}) + E_k^+(\phi^0_{k+1}) + \ E_k^{\#}(\phi^0_{k+1}\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{232}$$

4.6 scaling

From the last expression we form $\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) = \tilde{\rho}_k(\Phi_{k+1,L})L^{|\mathbb{T}^1_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}|/2}$. We have seen in lemma 3 that $\phi^0_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1,L}) = \phi_{k+1,L}$ and that that $S^0_{k+1}(\Phi^0_{k+1}, \phi^0_{k+1})$ scales to $S_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}, \phi_{k+1})$. We also have $\varepsilon_k^0 \text{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}) = L^3 \varepsilon_k^0 \text{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k-1})$.

In $E_k^+ = E_k - V_k$ we have

$$V_k(\phi_{k+1,L}) = L^3 \varepsilon_k \text{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{M+N-k-1}) + \frac{1}{2}L^2 \mu_k \|\phi_{k+1}\|^2 + \frac{1}{4}L\lambda_k \int \phi^4_{k+1} \tag{233}$$

For E_k there is a reblocking and we have that $E_k(\phi_{k+1,L}) = (\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}(\phi_{k+1})$ and more generally for $\phi \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ that $E_k(\phi_L) = (\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}(\phi)$. Since E_k is normalized for small polymers lemma 9 says

$$\|(\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}\|_{k+1,\kappa} \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^{-\epsilon}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \tag{234}$$

For $E_k^{\#}$ we have that $E_k^{\#}(\phi_{k+1,L}) = (\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}(\phi_{k+1})$ and more generally that $E_k^{\#}(\phi_L) = (\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}(\phi)$. This is not normalized. Instead we use the bound (230) in (131). For this we need $\kappa' \equiv \kappa - 4\kappa_0 - 3$ to satisfy $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{2}L(\kappa - 4\kappa_0 - 3) - 1$ which is true if $\kappa \geq 5\kappa_0$ and L is large enough. Then we have

$$\|(\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}\|_{k+1,\kappa} \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \tag{235}$$

Altogether then

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) =& Z_{k+1}\ \exp\Big(- S_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}, \phi_{k+1}) - L^3(\varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_k^0)\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k-1}) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}L^2\mu_k\|\phi_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{k+1}\int \phi_{k+1}^4 + (\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}(\phi_{k+1}) + (\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}(\phi_{k+1})\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{236}$$

4.7 completion of the proof

Neither $(\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}$ nor $(\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}$ are normalized for small polymers, and we need this feature to complete the induction. [4] We remove energy and mass terms to normalize them.

By (160)

$$(\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}(\phi_{k+1}) = -\mathcal{L}_1E_k\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{N+M-k-1}) - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}_2E_k\|\phi_{k+1}^2\| + (\mathcal{L}_3E_k)(\phi_{k+1}) \tag{237}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_1E_k =& \varepsilon((\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}) \\ \mathcal{L}_2E_k =& \mu((\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}) \\ \mathcal{L}_3E_k =& \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}})\end{aligned} \tag{238}$$

From the bound (234) and lemma 10 and lemma 11 we have that $|\mathcal{L}_1E_k|$ and $\|\mathcal{L}_3E_k\|_{k+1,\kappa}$ are bounded by $\mathcal{O}(L^{-\epsilon})\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa}$ and that $|\mathcal{L}_2E_k|$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(L^{-\epsilon})\lambda_k^{1/2+6\epsilon}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa}$. These are the required bounds

We also apply (160) to $(BE_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}$ but now tack on the extra term ε_k^0 We have

$$(BE_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}(\phi_{k+1}) - L^3\varepsilon_k^0\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{N+M-k-1}) = -\varepsilon_k^*\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{N+M-k-1}) - \frac{1}{2}\mu_k^*\|\phi_{k+1}^2\| + E_k^*(\phi_{k+1}) \tag{239}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_k^* =& L^3\varepsilon_k^0 + \varepsilon((\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}) \\ \mu_k^* =& \mu((\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}) \\ E_k^* =& \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{B}E_k^{\#})_{L^{-1}}\end{aligned} \tag{240}$$

From the bound (235) and lemma 10 and lemma 11, $|\varepsilon_k^*|$ and $\|E_k^*\|_{k+1,\kappa}$ are bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon}$ and $|\mu_k^*|$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon}$. These are the required bounds.

Insert these expansions into (236) and obtain the final form

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}) =& Z_{k+1}\ \exp\Big(- S_{k+1}(\Phi_{k+1}, \phi_{k+1}) - \varepsilon_{k+1}\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{T}_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k-1}) \\ & - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{k+1}\|\phi_{k+1}\|^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda_{k+1}\int \phi_{k+1}^4 + E_{k+1}(\phi_{k+1})\Big)\end{aligned} \tag{241}$$

where $\varepsilon_{k+1}, \mu_{k+1}, E_{k+1}$ are given by (174). This completes the proof.

---

[4] If we had normalized $E_k(X)$ for all polymers, not just small polymers, then $(\mathcal{B}E_k)_{L^{-1}}(X)$ would still be normalized. Then $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2$ would not appear below. This strategy is possible, but presents other difficulties.

4.8 derivatives

The previous proof was carried out under the assumption that λ_k is small and $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}, E_k \in \mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{K}_k^{norm})$ satisfy $|\mu_k| \leq \lambda_k^{1/2}$ and $\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \leq 1$. In this domain $\mu_k^* = \mu_k^*(\lambda_k, \mu_k, E_k)$ and $E_k^* = E_k^*(\lambda_k, \mu_k, E_k)$ satisfy the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_k^*| \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon} \\ \|E_k^*\|_{k,\kappa} \leq & \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \end{aligned} \tag{242}$$

However the proof works as well for $\mu_k \in \mathbb{C}, E_k \in \mathcal{K}_k^{norm}$ with exactly the same bounds, and one can show that μ_k^*, E_k^* are analytic functions of μ_k, E_k on this domain. This means we can use Cauchy bounds to get estimates on partial derivatives in a slightly smaller region.

Lemma 20. *In the region* $|\mu_k| \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_k^{1/2}$ *and* $\|E_k\|_k \leq \frac{1}{2}$ *we have*

$$\left|\frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial \mu_k}\right| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon} \qquad \left\|\frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial E_k}\right\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon} \tag{243}$$

$$\left|\frac{\partial E_k^*}{\partial \mu_k}\right| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{-1/4-10\epsilon} \qquad \left\|\frac{\partial E_k^*}{\partial E_k}\right\| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon} \tag{244}$$

Proof. We have

$$\frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial \mu_k} = \frac{d}{dt}\Big[\mu_k^*(\lambda_k, \mu_k + t, E_k)\Big]_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|t| = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_k^{1/2}} \frac{1}{t^2} \mu_k^*(\lambda_k, \mu_k + t, E_k) dt \tag{245}$$

whence

$$\left|\frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial \mu_k}\right| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) \lambda_k^{-1/2} (L^3 \lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon}) \leq \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon} \tag{246}$$

We also have for $\|\dot{E}\|_{k,\kappa} \leq 1$

$$< \frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial E_k}, \dot{E} > \equiv \frac{d}{dt}[\mu_k^*(\lambda_k, \mu_k, E_k + t\dot{E})]_{t=0} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|t| = \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{t^2} \mu_k^*(\lambda_k, \mu_k, E_k + t\dot{E}) dt \tag{247}$$

whence

$$| < \frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial E_k}, \dot{E} > | \leq \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon} \tag{248}$$

Then

$$\| \frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial E_k} \| = \sup_{\|\dot{E}\|_{k,\kappa} \leq 1} | < \frac{\partial \mu_k^*}{\partial E_k}, \dot{E} > | \leq \mathcal{O}(1) L^3 \lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon} \tag{249}$$

The estimates on the derivatives of E_k^* are similar.

5 the flow

We seek well-behaved solutions of the RG equations (174). [5] We continue to treat λ_k as a parameter, not a dynamical variable. Thus the equations of interest are

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{k+1} =& L^3 \varepsilon_k + \mathcal{L}_1 E_k + \varepsilon_k^* \\ \mu_{k+1} =& L^2 \mu_k + \mathcal{L}_2 E_k + \mu_k^* \\ E_{k+1} =& \mathcal{L}_3 E_k + E_k^* \end{aligned} \tag{250}$$

---

[5] This section is not particularly due to Balaban. We study the RG flow by a discrete dynamical systems approach. Somewhat similar methods can be found in [31], [29]. However those papers are concerned with infrared problems, not ultraviolet problems of the type considered here.

Keep in mind that the quantities $\varepsilon_k, \mu_k, \lambda_k, E_k$ determine a density ρ_k on the lattice $\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-k}$ as given by (170) (171).

The transformation is defined as long as λ_k is sufficiently small and $|\mu_k| \leq \lambda_k^{1/2}$ and $\|E_k\|_k \leq 1$. We make no restriction on the size of the bare coupling λ but the initial values $\lambda_0 = \lambda_0^{\mathsf{N}} = L^{-\mathsf{N}}\lambda$ will be be small enough for N sufficiently large, and we assume the other conditions are satisfied initally. We iterate it as long as the conditions are satisfied. Our goal is to show that for any N we can choose the initial point so that the solution exists for $k = 0, 1, \dots, K$ with $K = \mathsf{N} - \Delta$ and $\Delta \geq 0$ independent of N. Then at $k = K$ we are on the lattice $\mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\mathsf{N}-K} = \mathbb{T}^0_{\mathsf{M}+\Delta}$ and can make estimates on ρ_K uniformly in N (for small fields).

To accomplish this tuning we do not at first specify the initial values for ε_k, μ_k but instead specify final values for these quantities which for simplicity we take to be zero. Thus we look for solutions $\varepsilon_k, \mu_k, E_k$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K$ satisfying

$$\varepsilon_K = 0 \qquad \mu_K = 0 \qquad E_0 = 0 \tag{251}$$

This is non-perturbative renormalization - the initial values for ε, μ will depend on K and hence N. Note that the total mass at level K is then $\bar{\mu}_K + \mu_K = \bar{\mu}_K$.

At this point we temporarily drop ε_k as a variable since it does not afffect the others. Then we rewrite the flow equation as

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k =& L^{-2}(\mu_{k+1} - \mathcal{L}_2 E_k - \mu_k^*) \\ E_k =& \mathcal{L}_3 E_{k-1} + E_{k-1}^*) \end{aligned} \tag{252}$$

The first equation is for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K-1$ with value at K given by $\mu_K = 0$. The last equation for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$ with $E_0 = 0$. These equations have the same solutions as (250), but are contractive and hence more tractable. We analyze them as a fixed point problem.

Let $\xi_k = (\mu_k, E_k)$ be an element of the real Banach space $\mathbb{R} \times \mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{K}_k^{norm})$ and consider sequences

$$\underline{\xi} = (\xi_0, \dots, \xi_K) \tag{253}$$

Pick a fixed β satisfying

$$0 < \beta < \frac{1}{4} - 10\epsilon \tag{254}$$

and let B be the Banach space of all such sequences with norm

$$\|\underline{\xi}\| = \sup_{0 \leq k \leq K} \{\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_k|, \lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa}\} \tag{255}$$

This anticipates the kind of growth we can establish for solutions. Let B_0 be the subset of all sequences satisfying the boundary conditions. Thus

$$\mathsf{B}_0 = \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathsf{B} : \mu_K = 0, E_0 = 0\} \tag{256}$$

This is a complete metric space with distance $\|\underline{\xi} - \underline{\xi}'\|$. Finally let

$$\mathsf{B}_1 = \mathsf{B}_0 \cap \{\underline{\xi} \in \mathsf{B} : \|\underline{\xi}\| < 1\} \tag{257}$$

Next define an operator $\underline{\xi}' = T\underline{\xi}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_k' =& L^{-2}(\mu_{k+1} - \mathcal{L}_2 E_k - \mu_k^*) \\ E_k' =& \mathcal{L}_3 E_{k-1} + E_{k-1}^*) \end{aligned} \tag{258}$$

Then $\underline{\xi}$ is a solution of (251), (252) iff it is a fixed point for T on B_0. We look for such fixed points in B_1.

We proceed under the assumption that

$$\lambda_K = \lambda_K^{\mathsf{N}} = L^{-(\mathsf{N}-K)}\lambda = L^{-\Delta}\lambda \tag{259}$$

is sufficiently small. This can be arranged either by taking λ small (in which case we can take $\Delta = 0$ and $K = \mathsf{N}$), or more generally by taking Δ large. If $\lambda_K = L^{-\Delta}\lambda$ is sufficiently small then T is defined on B_1. This follows since we have $\lambda_k \leq \lambda_K$ small and

$$|\mu_k|\lambda_k^{-1/2} \leq \lambda_k^{\beta} \qquad \|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \leq \lambda_k^{\beta} \tag{260}$$

which is well within the allowed region $|\mu_k|\lambda_k^{-1/2} \leq 1, \|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \leq 1$.

Lemma 21. *Let $\lambda_K = L^{-\Delta}\lambda$ be sufficiently small. Then for all $\mathsf{N} \geq \Delta$ and $K = \mathsf{N} - \Delta$*

1. *The transformation T maps the set B_1 to itself.*
2. *There is a unique fixed point $T\underline{\xi} = \underline{\xi}$ in this set.*

Proof. (1.) We use the bounds of theorem 12 for $\mathcal{L}_2, \mathcal{L}_3$ (replacing $\mathcal{O}(1)L^{-\epsilon}$ by 1) and for μ_k^*, E_k^*. To show the the map sends B_1 to itself we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_k'| \leq & \lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}L^{-2}\Big(|\mu_{k+1}| + \lambda_k^{1/2+6\epsilon}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} + \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon}\Big)\\ \leq & L^{\beta-\frac{3}{2}}\Big[\lambda_{k+1}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_{k+1}|\Big] + L^{-2}\lambda_k^{1/4+6\epsilon}\Big[\lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa}\Big] + \mathcal{O}(1)L\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{4}-\beta-4\epsilon}\\ \leq & \frac{1}{2}(\|\underline{\xi}\| + 1) \leq 1\end{aligned} \tag{261}$$

Here we use that $L^{\beta-3/2} \leq 1/4$ for L large, that $\lambda_{k+1}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_{k+1}| \leq \|\underline{\xi}\|$, that $L^{-2}\lambda_k^{6\epsilon} \leq 1/4$, that $\lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \leq \|\underline{\xi}\|$ and that $\mathcal{O}(1)L\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{4}-\beta-4\epsilon} \leq 1/2$ for λ_k small (depending on L). We also have for L sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E_k'\|_{k,\kappa} \leq & \lambda_k^{-\beta}\Big(\|E_{k-1}\|_{k-1,\kappa} + \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_{k-1}^{1/4-10\epsilon}\Big)\\ \leq & L^{-\beta}\Big[\lambda_{k-1}^{-\beta}\|E_{k-1}\|_{k-1,\kappa}\Big] + \mathcal{O}(1)L^{3-\beta}\lambda_{k-1}^{1/4-\beta-10\epsilon}\\ \leq & \frac{1}{2}(\|\underline{\xi}\| + 1) \leq 1\end{aligned} \tag{262}$$

Combining this with (261) yields $\|T(\underline{\xi})\| \leq 1$ as required.

(2.) By the standard fixed point theorem in a complete metric space it suffices to show that the mapping is a contraction. We show that under our assumptions

$$\|T(\underline{\xi_1}) - T(\underline{\xi_2})\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\underline{\xi_1} - \underline{\xi_2}\| \tag{263}$$

First for the μ terms we have (suppressing the dependence of μ_k^* on λ_k)

$$\mu_{1,k}' - \mu_{2,k}' = L^{-2}\Big((\mu_{1,k+1} - \mu_{2,k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(E_{1,k} - E_{2,k}) - (\mu_k^*(\mu_{1,k}, E_{1,k}) - \mu_k^*(\mu_{2,k}, E_{2,k}))\Big) \tag{264}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_{1,k}' - \mu_{2,k}'| \leq L^{-2}\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_{1,k+1} - \mu_{2,k+1}|\\ &+L^{-2}\lambda_k^{-\beta+6\epsilon}\|E_{1,k} - E_{2,k}\|_{k,\kappa} + L^{-2}\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}\Big|\mu_k^*(\mu_{1,k}, E_{1,k}) - \mu_k^*(\mu_{2,k}, E_{2,k})\Big|\end{aligned} \tag{265}$$

The first term is

$$L^{\beta-\frac{3}{2}}\Big[\lambda_{k+1}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_{1,k+1}-\mu_{2,k+1}|\Big] \leq L^{\beta-\frac{3}{2}}\|\underline{\xi_1}-\underline{\xi_2}\| \tag{266}$$

The second term is

$$L^{-2}\lambda_k^{6\epsilon}\Big[\lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E_{1,k}-E_{2,k}\|_{k,\kappa}\Big] \leq L^{-2}\lambda_k^{6\epsilon}\|\underline{\xi_1}-\underline{\xi_2}\| \tag{267}$$

For the last term we write with $\mu(t) = t\mu_{1,k} + (1-t)\mu_{2,k}$ and $E(t) = tE_{1,k} + (1-t)E_{2,k}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_k^*(\mu_{1,k}, E_{1,k}) - \mu_k^*(\mu_{2,k}, E_{2,k})\\
=&\mu_k^*(\mu_{1,k}, E_{1,k}) - \mu_k^*(\mu_{2,k}, E_{1,k}) + \mu_k^*(\mu_{2,k}, E_{1,k}) - \mu_k^*(\mu_{2,k}, E_{2,k})\\
=&\int_0^1 \frac{\partial\mu_k^*}{\partial\mu_k}(\mu(t), E_{1,k})(\mu_{1,k}-\mu_{2,k})dt + \int_0^1 \Big\langle \frac{\partial\mu_k^*}{\partial E_k}(\mu_{2,k}, E(t)), E_{1,k}-E_{2,k}\Big\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{268}$$

We use the bounds $|\partial\mu_k^*/\partial\mu_k| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon}$ and $\|\partial\mu_k^*/\partial E_k\|_k \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon}$ from lemma 20. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}\Big|\mu_k^*(\mu_{1,k}, E_{1,k}) - \mu_k^*(\mu_{2,k}, E_{2,k})\Big|\\
\leq&\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}\Big(\mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon}|\mu_{1,k}-\mu_{2,k}| + \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{3/4-4\epsilon}\|E_{1,k}-E_{2,k}\|_{k,\kappa}\Big)\\
\leq&\mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon}\Big[\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_{1,k}-\mu_{2,k}|\Big] + \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon}\Big[\lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E_{1,k}-E_{2,k}\|_{k,\kappa}\Big]\\
\leq&\mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{1/4-4\epsilon}\|\underline{\xi_1}-\underline{\xi_2}\|
\end{aligned} \tag{269}$$

Altogether then for L large and λ_k small $\lambda_k^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu'_{1,k}-\mu'_{2,k}| \leq 1/2\|\underline{\xi_1}-\underline{\xi_2}\|$ as required.

Now consider the E terms. We have

$$E'_{1,k} - E'_{2,k} = \mathcal{L}_3(E_{1,k-1}-E_{2,k-1}) + (E^*_{1,k-1}(\mu_{1,k-1}, E_{1,k-1}) - E^*_{2,k-1}(\mu_{2,k-1}, E_{2,k-1})) \tag{270}$$

Then

$$\lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E'_{1,k}-E'_{2,k}\|_{k,\kappa} \leq L^{-\beta}\lambda_{k-1}^{-\beta}\Big(\|E_{1,k-1}-E_{2,k-1}\|_{k-1,\kappa} + \|E^*_{1,k-1}-E^*_{2,k-1}\|_{k-1,\kappa}\Big) \tag{271}$$

The first term is bounded by $L^{-\beta}\|\underline{\xi_1}-\underline{\xi_2}\|$. For the second term let $\mu(t) = t\mu_{1,k-1} + (1-t)\mu_{2,k-1}$ and $E(t) = tE_{1,k-1} + (1-t)E_{2,k-1}$ and write

$$\begin{aligned}
&E^*_{k-1}(\mu_{1,k-1}, E_{1,k-1}) - E^*_{k-1}(\mu_{2,k-1}, E_{2,k-1})\\
=&\int_0^1 \frac{\partial E^*_{k-1}}{\partial\mu_{k-1}}(\mu(t), E_{1,k-1})(\mu_{1,k-1}-\mu_{2,k-1})dt - \int_0^1 \Big\langle \frac{\partial E^*_{k-1}}{\partial E_{k-1}}(\mu_{2,k-1}, E(t)), E_{1,k-1}-E_{2,k-1}\Big\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{272}$$

We use the bounds $|\partial E_k^*/\partial\mu_k| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_k^{-1/4-10\epsilon}$ and $\|\partial E_k^*/\partial E_k\|_k \leq \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_{k-1}^{1/4-10\epsilon}$ from (20). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&L^{-\beta}\lambda_{k-1}^{-\beta}\|E^*_{1,k-1}-E^*_{2,k-1}\|_{k-1,\kappa}\\
\leq&L^{-\beta}\lambda_{k-1}^{-\beta}\Big(\mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_{k-1}^{-1/4-10\epsilon}|\mu_{1,k-1}-\mu_{2,k-1}| + \mathcal{O}(1)L^3\lambda_{k-1}^{1/4-10\epsilon}\|E_{1,k-1}-E_{2,k-1}\|_{k-1,\kappa}\Big)\\
\leq&\mathcal{O}(1)L^{3-\beta}\lambda_{k-1}^{1/4-10\epsilon}\Big[\lambda_{k-1}^{-\frac{1}{2}-\beta}|\mu_{1,k-1}-\mu_{2,k-1}|\Big] + \mathcal{O}(1)L^{3-\beta}\lambda_{k-1}^{1/4-10\epsilon}\Big[\lambda_{k-1}^{-\beta}\|E_{1,k-1}-E_{2,k-1}\|_{k-1,\kappa}\Big]\\
\leq&\mathcal{O}(1)L^{3-\beta}\lambda_k^{1/4-10\epsilon}\|\underline{\xi_1}-\underline{\xi_2}\|
\end{aligned} \tag{273}$$

Altogether then for L large and λ_k small we have $\lambda_k^{-\beta}\|E'_{1,k}-E'_{2,k}\|_{k,\kappa} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|\xi_1-\xi_2\|$ which completes the proof.

Now we can state:

Theorem 22. *Let* $\lambda_K = L^{-\Delta}\lambda$ *be sufficiently small. Then for* $N \geq \Delta$ *there is a unique sequence* $\varepsilon_k, \mu_k, E_k$ *for* $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, K = \mathsf{N} - \Delta$ *satisfying of the dynamical equation (250), the boundary conditions (251), and*

$$|\mu_k| \leq \lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2}+\beta} \qquad \|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \leq \lambda_k^{\beta} \tag{274}$$

Furthermore

$$\varepsilon_k \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{\beta} \tag{275}$$

Proof. This solution is the fixed point from the previous lemma and the bounds (274) are a consequence.

To complete the proof we check the estimate on the vacuum energy. Once μ_k, E_k are fixed ε_k is determined by $\varepsilon_{k+1} = L^3\varepsilon_k + \mathcal{L}_1(E_k) + \varepsilon_k^*(\mu_k, \lambda_k, E_k)$ or by

$$\varepsilon_k = L^{-3}(\varepsilon_{k+1} - \mathcal{L}_1(E_k) - \varepsilon_k^*) \tag{276}$$

starting with $\varepsilon_K = 0$. We have $|\mathcal{L}_1(E_k)| \leq \|E_k\|_{k,\kappa} \leq \lambda_k^{\beta}$ and $|L^{-3}\varepsilon_k^*| \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{4}-10\epsilon} \leq \mathcal{O}(1)\lambda_k^{\beta}$. Therefore for some constant $b = \mathcal{O}(1)$

$$|\varepsilon_k| \leq L^{-3}|\varepsilon_{k+1}| + b\lambda_k^{\beta} \tag{277}$$

At $k = K - 1$ it says $|\varepsilon_{K-1}| \leq b\lambda_{K-1}^{\beta}$. This gives an inequality for $|\varepsilon_{K-2}|$ and we repeat this process. We claim that in general

$$|\varepsilon_{K-n}| \leq b\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} L^{(\beta-3)j}\Big)\lambda_{K-n}^{\beta} \tag{278}$$

Suppose it is true for $K - n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\varepsilon_{K-n-1}| \leq & L^{-3}b\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} L^{(\beta-3)j}\Big)\lambda_{K-n}^{\beta} + b\lambda_{K-n-1}^{\beta} \\ \leq & b\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{n} L^{(\beta-3)j}\Big)\lambda_{K-n-1}^{\beta} \end{aligned} \tag{279}$$

Here we used $\lambda_{K-n}^{\beta} = L^{\beta}\lambda_{K-n-1}^{\beta}$. Thus (278) is true for $K - n - 1$, hence (278) is established, and this implies the result (275) since the series converges.

Remarks.

1. Our method is efficient, but the estimates are not very sharp. For example we get $\varepsilon_k = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_k^{\beta})$ and $\mu_k = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_k^{\frac{1}{2}+\beta})$ for $\beta < \frac{1}{4}$, whereas pertubation theory suggests that both are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda_k)$.
2. In the second paper we analyze the renormalization group transformations without the small field assumptions in this paper. This is accomplished with by splitting the fluctuation integrals into large and small field region at each step. The result is an expansion with terms labeled by decreasing sequence of small field regions. The leading term in this expansion is the case where each small field region is the whole torus - the case considered in this paper. The bounds of this paper will also be useful in estimating the other terms in the expansion, leading to a proof of theorem 1.

A estimates

Let X be an M-polymer as defined in section 3.1, although not necessarily in dimension $d=3$. So X is a connected union of M-blocks $\square$ centered on lattice points. Let $|X|_M$ be the number of M-blocks in X and let $Md_M(X)$ be the length of a minimal tree connecting the blocks in X.

Lemma 23.

1. *There are constants a, b such that for any $\square$*

$$\sum_{X:\ X\supset\square} \exp(-a|X|_M) \leq b \tag{280}$$

2. *There are constants κ_0, K_0 such that for any $\square$*

$$\sum_{X:\ X\supset\square} \exp(-\kappa_0 d_M(X)) \leq K_0 \tag{281}$$

Remark. The sums are independent of M so it suffices to prove it for $M=1$. In this case we drop the subscript M. The constants depend only on the dimension.

Proof. [36]

1. We have

$$\sum_{X:\ X\supset\square} \exp(-a|X|) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-an}|\{X\supset\square : |X|=n\}| \tag{282}$$

Thus we have to estimate the number of polymers X with $|X|=n$ containing $\square$. For each such X consider the connected graph with lines joining the centers of adjacent cubes. Delete lines until you have a tree. The tree will connect all the cubes in X and have $n-1$ lines of unit length. The tree can be traversed with a path starting at $\square$ that goes over each line twice and has length $2(n-1)$. Distinct polymers give distinct paths so the number of polymers is bounded by the number of paths of length $2(n-1)$. But the latter can be estimated by $(2^d)^{2(n-1)}$. Thus

$$\sum_{X:\ X\supset\square} \exp(-a|X|) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-an}(2^d)^{2(n-1)} = 2^{-2d}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\exp((-a+2d\log 2)n) \leq b \tag{283}$$

for suitable b provided $a > 2d\log 2$.

2. We use the inequality $d(X) \geq 3^{-d}|X| - 1$ quoted in (117). Therefore

$$\sum_{X:\ X\supset\square} \exp(-\kappa_0 d(X)) \leq e^{\kappa_0} \sum_{X:\ X\supset\square} \exp(-3^{-d}\kappa_0|X|) \leq K_0 \tag{284}$$

provided $\kappa_0 \geq 3^d a$ and $K_0 \geq e^{\kappa_0} b$.

Corollary 24.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{X:X\cap Y\neq\emptyset} e^{-a|X|_M} &\leq b|Y|_M \\ \sum_{X:X\cap Y\neq\emptyset} e^{-\kappa_0 d_M(X)} &\leq K_0|Y|_M \end{aligned} \tag{285}$$

Proof. Again it suffices to take $M=1$. The first follows by

$$\sum_{X:X\cap Y\neq\emptyset} e^{-a|X|} \leq \sum_{\square\subset Y}\sum_{X\supset\square} e^{-a|X|} \leq b|Y| \tag{286}$$

The second is similar.

B cluster expansion

We give a treatment of the standard cluster expansion adapted to our circumstances. General references are [32], [39], [28], [36]. We present an ultralocal version favored by Balaban.

Consider fields Φ and $M-$polymers X on a d-dimensional unit toroidal lattice. We are given localized functionals $H(X,\Phi)$ depending on Φ only in X and integrals of the form

$$\Xi = \int \exp\left(\sum_X H(X,\Phi)\right) d\mu(\Phi) \tag{287}$$

where $d\mu(\Phi) = \prod_x d\mu(\Phi(x))$ is an ultralocal probability measure. These do not occur naturally in quantum field theory, but can be arranged as we have seen in the text. Our goal is to give a local structure to this integral. This is particularly important if there are other spectator fields which for which we want to localize the dependence.

Theorem 25. *(cluster expansion) There is a constant c_0 depending only on the dimension such that if $H(X,\Phi)$ satisfies*

$$|H(X,\Phi)| \leq H_0 e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{288}$$

on the support of μ with $\kappa > 3\kappa_0 + 3$ and $H_0 \leq c_0$ then

$$\Xi = \exp\Big(\sum_Y H^{\#}(Y)\Big) \tag{289}$$

where $H^{\#}(Y)$ only depends on $H(X)$ for $X \subset Y$ and

$$|H^{\#}(Y)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) H_0 e^{-(\kappa - 3\kappa_0 - 3)d_M(Y)} \tag{290}$$

The constant $\mathcal{O}(1)$ depends only on the dimension.

Proof. **step 1:** Start with a Mayer expansion which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \exp\left(\sum_X H(X,\Phi)\right) &= \prod_X \Big((e^{H(X,\Phi)} - 1) + 1\Big) \\ &= \sum_{\{X_i\}} \prod_i (e^{H(X_i,\Phi)} - 1) \\ &= \sum_{\{Y_j\}} \prod_j K(Y_j,\Phi) \end{aligned} \tag{291}$$

Here the product over X is written as a sum over collections of distinct polymers $\{X_i\}$. Then terms in this sum are grouped together into collections of disjoint polymers $\{Y_j\}$ (possibly empty), defining for connected Y

$$K(Y,\Phi) = \sum_{\{X_i\}:\cup X_i = Y} \prod_i (e^{H(X_i,\Phi)} - 1) \tag{292}$$

In this sum we require that the $\{X_i\}$ cannot be divided into two disjoint sets. Instead of unordered $\{X_i\}$ we can write this as a sum over ordered sets $(X_1, \dots X_n)$ by

$$K(Y,\Phi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(X_1,\cdots X_n):\cup_i X_i = Y} \prod_i (e^{H(X_i,\Phi)} - 1) \tag{293}$$

still with the same conditions on the X_i.

If $H_0 \leq \log 2$ then on the support of μ

$$|e^{H(X,\Phi)} - 1| \leq 2H(X,\Phi) \leq 2H_0 e^{-\kappa d_M(X)} \tag{294}$$

and so

$$|K(Y,\Phi)| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(X_1,\cdots X_n):\cup_i X_i = Y} \prod_{i=1}^{n} 2H_0 e^{-\kappa d_M(X_i)} \tag{295}$$

Next we claim that if $\cup_{i=1}^n X_i = Y$ as above, then

$$M d_M(Y) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} M d_M(X_i) + M(n-1) \tag{296}$$

Indeed let τ_i be a minimal tree on X_i of length $Md_M(X_i)$ Also consider the connected graph whose edges are pairs $\{X_i, X_j\}$ such that $X_i \cap X_j \neq \emptyset$. Take a tree which is a subgraph with $(n-1)$ edges. Each pair $\{X_i, X_j\}$ in this tree will have a block $\square$ in common. For each pair add a line in $\square$ joining the point in τ_i to the point in τ_j. This line has length at most M. The tree graph consisting of the τ_i and the $(n-1)$ extra lines now joins all the blocks in Y and has length less than $\sum_{i=1}^n Md_M(X_i) + M(n-1)$. The minimal tree must have shorter length which is the claim.

We use this to extract a factor $\exp\Big(-(\kappa-\kappa_0)(d_M(Y)-(n-1))\Big)$. Dropping all conditions on the X_i except $X_i \subset Y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|K(Y,\Phi)| \leq & e^{-(\kappa-\kappa_0)d_M(Y)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} e^{(\kappa-\kappa_0)n} \sum_{(X_1,\cdots X_n)\subset Y^n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} 2H_0 e^{-\kappa_0 d_M(X_i)} \\
\leq & e^{-(\kappa-\kappa_0)d_M(Y)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \Big(e^{\kappa-\kappa_0} \sum_{X\subset Y} 2H_0 e^{-\kappa_0 d_M(X)} \Big)^n \\
\leq & e^{-(\kappa-\kappa_0)d_M(Y)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \Big(2H_0 K_0 e^{\kappa-\kappa_0} |Y|_M \Big)^n \\
\leq & e^{-(\kappa-\kappa_0)d_M(Y)} 2H_0 K_0 e^{\kappa-\kappa_0} |Y|_M \exp\Big(2H_0 K_0 e^{\kappa-\kappa_0} |Y|_M \Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{297}$$

Now $|Y|_M \leq 3^d(1+d_M(Y)) \leq \kappa_0(1+d_M(Y))$. Furthermore we assume c_0 is small enough so that $2c_0 K_0 \kappa_0 e^{\kappa-\kappa_0} \leq 1$. (So c_0 does depend on κ.) Then the exponent is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)e^{d_M(Y)}$ and downstairs $2H_0K_0e^{\kappa-\kappa_0}|Y|_M$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(1)H_0 e^{d_M(Y)}$. Altogether then on the support of μ

$$|K(Y,\Phi)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) H_0 e^{-(\kappa-\kappa_0-2)d_M(Y)} \tag{298}$$

step 2: Now because the Y_j are disjoint and because fields at different sites are independent random variables

$$\int \Big(\sum_{\{Y_j\}} \prod_j K(Y_j,\Phi) \Big) d\mu(\Phi) = \sum_{\{Y_j\}} \prod_j K^{\#}(Y_j) \tag{299}$$

where

$$K^{\#}(Y) = \int K(Y,\Phi) d\mu(\Phi) \tag{300}$$

satisfies the same bound

$$|K^{\#}(Y)| \leq \mathcal{O}(1) H_0 e^{-(\kappa-\kappa_0-2)d_M(Y)} \tag{301}$$

step 3: Next we claim that

$$\sum_{\{Y_i\}} \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) = \exp\Big(\sum_Y H^{\#}(Y)\Big) \tag{302}$$

where

$$H^{\#}(Y) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n):\cup_i Y_i = Y} \rho^T(Y_1,\dots,Y_n) \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) \tag{303}$$

and $\rho^T(Y_1,\dots,Y_n)$ vanishes if the Y_j can be divided into disjoint sets. At first we demonstrate the identity as formal series. Afterwards we demonstrate convergence.

Start by writing

$$\sum_{\{Y_i\}} \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n):Y_i \cap Y_j = \emptyset} \prod_{i=1}^{n} K^{\#}(Y_i) \tag{304}$$

where the sum is now over ordered n-tuples of polymers. Next let $\zeta(X,Y) = 1$ if $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $\zeta(X,Y) = 0$ if if $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. Then this can be written

$$1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n):} \prod_{i=1}^{n} K^{\#}(Y_i) \prod_{\{i,j\} \subset (1,\dots,n)} \zeta(Y_i, Y_j) \tag{305}$$

Next write

$$\prod_{\{i,j\}} \zeta(Y_i,Y_j) = \prod_{\{i,j\}} \big[1 + (\zeta(Y_i,Y_j) - 1)\big] = \sum_G \prod_{\{i,j\} \in G} (\zeta(Y_i,Y_j) - 1) \tag{306}$$

Here in the second step we expand out the product and identify the sum with a sum over collections of pairs $\{i,j\}$ from $(1,\dots n)$, that is with graphs G on $(1,\dots,n)$. Each graph determines a partition $\{I_1,\dots,I_K\}$ of $(1,\dots,n)$ and we group together terms which give the same partition. Then we have

$$\prod_{\{i,j\}} \zeta(Y_i,Y_j) = \sum_{K=1}^{n} \sum_{\{I_1,\dots,I_K\} \in \pi_{n,K}} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \rho^T(Y_{I_k}) \tag{307}$$

where $\pi_{n,K}$ is the partitions of $(1,\dots,n)$ into K subsets. We have defined $\rho^T(Y) = 1$ and for $n \geq 2$

$$\rho^T(Y_1,\dots Y_n) = \sum_G \prod_{\{i,j\} \in G} (\zeta(Y_i,Y_j) - 1) \tag{308}$$

where the sum is now over connected graphs G on $(1,\dots,n)$. We do have $\rho^T(Y_1,\dots Y_n) = 0$ if the Y_j can be divided into disjoint sets.

Inserting (307) into (305) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\{Y_i\}} \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) =& 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n):} \prod_{i=1}^{n} K^{\#}(Y_i) \sum_{K=1}^{n} \sum_{\{I_1,\dots,I_K\} \in \pi_{n,K}} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \rho^T(Y_{I_k}) \\
=& 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{K=1}^{n} \sum_{\{I_1,\dots,I_K\} \in \pi_{n,K}} \prod_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{Y_{I_k}} \rho^T(Y_{I_k}) \prod_{i \in I_k} K^{\#}(Y_i) \\
=& 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{K=1}^{n} \sum_{\{I_1,\dots,I_K\} \in \pi_{n,K}} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f(|I_k|)
\end{aligned} \tag{309}$$

In the last step we defined for $N \geq 1$

$$f(N) = \sum_{(Y_1, \ldots Y_N)} \rho^T(Y_1, \ldots, Y_N) \prod_{i=1}^{N} K^{\#}(Y_i) \tag{310}$$

Replace the sum over partitions $\{I_1, \ldots, I_K\}$ by a sum over ordered partitions $(I_1, \ldots, I_K)$. The summand only depends on the number of elements $N_k = |I_k|$ in each set. For each $(N_1, \ldots, N_K)$ with $N_k \geq 1$ the number of partitions with these numbers is $n!/N_1! \ldots N_K!$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\{I_1,\ldots,I_K\} \in \pi_{n,K}} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f(|I_k|) =& \frac{1}{K!} \sum_{(I_1,\ldots,I_K)} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f(|I_k|) \\ =& \frac{1}{K!} \sum_{(N_1,\ldots,N_K): \sum_k N_k = n} \frac{n!}{N_1! \ldots N_K!} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f(N_k)\end{aligned} \tag{311}$$

Insert this into (309) and change the order of summations

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\{Y_i\}} \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) =& 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{K=1}^{n} \frac{1}{K!} \sum_{(N_1,\ldots,N_K): \sum_k N_k = n} \frac{n!}{N_1! \ldots N_K!} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f(N_k) \\ =& 1 + \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{K!} \sum_{n \geq K}^{\infty} \sum_{(N_1,\ldots,N_K): \sum_k N_k = n} \frac{1}{N_1! \ldots N_K!} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f(N_k) \\ =& 1 + \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{K!} \sum_{(N_1,\ldots,N_K): N_k \geq 1} \frac{1}{N_1! \ldots N_K!} \prod_{k=1}^{K} f(N_k) \\ =& 1 + \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{K!} \Big(\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N!} f(N) \Big)^K = \exp \Big(\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N!} f(N) \Big)\end{aligned} \tag{312}$$

The result now follows from

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{N!} f(N) = \sum_{Y} H^{\#}(Y) \tag{313}$$

step 4: We now demonstrate that under our assumptions the series (303) defining $H^{\#}$ converges.

Each indivisible n-tuple $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ determines a connected graph g on $(1, \ldots, n)$: a pair $\{i, j\} \in g$ if $Y_i \cap Y_j \neq \emptyset$. We write $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n) \to g$ The expression $\rho^T(Y_1, \ldots Y_n)$ only depends on the graph (it is a certain sum over subgraphs) and one can show that

$$|\rho^T(Y_1, \ldots Y_n)| \leq \text{ number of tree graphs contained in } g \tag{314}$$

Now fix n and Y and let us restrict to sums over $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ such that $\cup_i Y_i = Y$.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)} \rho^T(Y_1, \ldots Y_n) \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) \leq& \sum_g \sum_{(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) \to g} \rho^T(Y_1, \ldots Y_n) \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) \\ \leq& \sum_g \sum_{(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) \to g} \sum_{\tau \subset g} \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) \\ =& \sum_\tau \sum_{g \supset \tau} \sum_{(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) \to g} \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) \\ =& \sum_\tau \sum_{(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n) \to g : g \supset \tau} \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i)\end{aligned} \tag{315}$$

If $\kappa_2 = \kappa - \kappa_0 - 1$ we have by (301) the bound

$$\left| \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n)} \rho^T(Y_1,\dots Y_n) \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) \right| \leq (\mathcal{O}(1)H_0)^n \sum_{\tau} \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n)\to g: g\supset\tau} \prod_i e^{-\kappa_2 d_M(Y_i)} \tag{316}$$

Next use the inequality (296) to bound this by

$$e^{-(\kappa_2-2\kappa_0)d_M(Y)} \Big(\mathcal{O}(1)H_0\Big)^n \sum_{\tau} \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n)\to g: g\supset\tau} \prod_i e^{-2\kappa_0 d_M(Y_i)} \tag{317}$$

After relabeling a tree graph τ can be thought of as a map τ from $(1,\dots n)$ to itself such that $\tau(j) < j$. The restrictions in the sum over $(Y_1,\dots,Y_n)$ are then that $Y_j \cap Y_{\tau(j)} \neq \emptyset$. For the sum over Y_n we we have by (285)

$$\sum_{Y_n \cap Y_{\tau(n)} \neq \emptyset} e^{-2\kappa_0 d_M(Y_n)} \leq K_0 |Y_{\tau(n)}|_M \tag{318}$$

Continue summing over $Y_{n-1}, Y_{n-2}, \dots$. By the time we get to the j^{th} vertex we will have accumulated a factor $|Y_j|^{\tau^{-1}(j)} = |Y_j|^{d_j-1}$ where d_j is the incidence number at j for τ. Then we estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{Y_j \cap Y_{\tau(j)} \neq \emptyset} e^{-2\kappa_0 d_M(Y_j)} |Y_j|_M^{d_j-1} \leq & (d_j-1)! \sum_{Y_j \cap Y_{\tau(j)} \neq \emptyset} e^{-2\kappa_0 d_M(Y_j)} e^{|Y_j|_M} \\ \leq & (d_j-1)! K_0 e^{\kappa_0} |Y_{\tau(j)}|\end{aligned} \tag{319}$$

Here we used again $|Y_j|_M \leq \kappa_0(1 + d_M(Y_j))$ The last step is

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{Y_1 \subset Y} e^{-2\kappa_0 d_M(Y_1)} |Y_1|_M^{d_1-1} \leq & (d_1-1)! \sum_{Y_1 \subset Y} e^{-2\kappa_0 d_M(Y_j)} e^{|Y_1|_M} \\ \leq & (d_1-1)! K_0 e^{\kappa_0} |Y|_M \leq (d_1-1)! K_0 \kappa_0 e^{\kappa_0} e^{d_M(Y)}\end{aligned} \tag{320}$$

Combining the above yields

$$\left| \sum_{(Y_1,\dots,Y_n)} \rho^T(Y_1,\dots Y_n) \prod_i K^{\#}(Y_i) \right| \leq e^{-(\kappa_2-2\kappa_0-1)d_M(Y)} (\mathcal{O}(1)H_0)^n \sum_{\tau} \prod_{j=1}^n (d_j-1)! \tag{321}$$

By Cayley's theorem the number of trees with incidence numbers d_j is $(n-2)!/\prod_{j=1}^n (d_j-1)!$ so we have

$$\sum_{\tau} \prod_{j=1}^n (d_j-1)! = \sum_{d_1,\dots,d_n} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n (d_j-1)! \right) \sum_{\tau \text{ with } d_j} 1 \leq \sum_{d_1,\dots,d_n} (n-2)! \leq (n-2)! 4^{n-1} \tag{322}$$

In the last step we used that a tree graph has $n-1$ lines so $\sum_{j=1}^n (d_j - 1) = 2(n-1) - n = n-2$ and

$$\sum_{d_1,\dots,d_n: \sum_j (d_j-1) = n-2} 1 \leq 2^{n-2} \sum_{(d_1,\dots,d_n)} 2^{-\sum_j (d_j-1)} \leq 2^{n-2} 2^n \leq 4^{n-1} \tag{323}$$

Now use (322) in (321), divide by $n!$ and sum over n to get a bound on $H^{\#}(Y)$. We have

$$|H^{\#}(Y)| \leq e^{-(\kappa_2-2\kappa_0-1)d_M(Y)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mathcal{O}(1)H_0)^n \leq \mathcal{O}(1) H_0 e^{-(\kappa_2-2\kappa_0-1)d_M(Y)} \tag{324}$$

provided $H_0 \leq c_0$ and c_0 is sufficiently small. Since $\kappa_2 - 2\kappa_0 - 1 = \kappa - 3\kappa_0 - 3$ this completes the proof.

C an identity

We seek an expression for $C_{k,x} = \Big(\Delta_k + \frac{a}{L^2} Q^T Q + x\Big)^{-1}$

Lemma 26.

$$C_{k,x} = A_{k,x} + a_k^2 A_{k,x} Q_k G_{k,x} Q_k^T A_{k,x} \tag{325}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k,x} =& \frac{1}{a_k + x}(I - Q^T Q) + \frac{1}{a_k + aL^{-2} + x} Q^T Q \\ G_{k,x} =& \Big(-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k - a_k^2 Q_k^T A_{k,x} Q_k \Big)^{-1} \end{aligned} \tag{326}$$

Remark. We can also write

$$a_k Q_k^T Q_k - a_k^2 Q_k^T A_{k,x} Q_k = \frac{a_k x}{a_k + x} Q_k^T Q_k + \frac{a_k^2 a L^{-2}}{(a_k + x)(a_k + aL^{-2} + x)} Q_{k+1}^T Q_{k+1} \tag{327}$$

which shows we are inverting a positive operator in the definition of $G_{k,x}$. Also note that with $x = 0$ this expression is just $a_{k+1} L^{-2} Q_{k+1}^T Q_{k+1}$ so we have at $x = 0$

$$G_{k,0} = \Big(-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_{k+1} L^{-2} Q_{k+1}^T Q_{k+1} \Big)^{-1} \tag{328}$$

This has an effective mass $\mathcal{O}(L^{-2})$ so we do not get a decay rate uniform in L.

Proof. Start with

$$\exp(\frac{1}{2} < f, C_{k,x} f >) = \text{const} \int d\Phi \exp\Big(< \Phi, f > - \frac{a}{2L^2} \|Q\Phi\|^2 - \frac{x}{2}\|\Phi\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} < \Phi, \Delta_k \Phi > \Big) \tag{329}$$

and from section 2.2

$$\exp\Big(-\frac{1}{2} < \Phi, \Delta_k \Phi > \Big) = \text{const} \int \exp\Big(-\frac{a_k}{2} \|\Phi - Q_k \phi\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} < \phi, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k)\phi > \Big)\ d\phi \tag{330}$$

Insert the second into the first and do the integral over Φ which is

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\Phi \exp\Big(< \Phi, f > - \frac{a}{2L^2}\|Q\Phi\|^2 - \frac{x}{2}\|\Phi\|^2 - \frac{a_k}{2}\|\Phi - Q_k\phi\|^2 \Big) \\ =& \int d\Phi \exp\Big(< \Phi, f + a_k Q_k \phi > - \frac{1}{2} < \Phi, \Big(a_k + x + aL^{-2} Q_k^T Q_k\Big)\Phi > - \frac{a_k}{2}\|Q_k\phi\|^2 \Big) \\ =& \text{const} \exp\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Big\langle (f + a_k Q_k), A_{k,x}(f + a_k Q_k) \Big\rangle - \frac{a_k}{2}\|Q_k \phi\|^2 \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{331}$$

Here we used $\Big(a_k + x + aL^{-2} Q_k^T Q_k\Big)^{-1} = A_{k,x}$ which follows since $Q_k^T Q_k$ is a projection. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \exp(\frac{1}{2} < f, C_{k,x} f >) \\ =& \text{const} \int \exp\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Big\langle (f + a_k Q_k \phi), A_{k,x}(f + a_k Q_k \phi) \Big\rangle - \frac{1}{2} < \phi, (-\Delta + \bar{\mu}_k + a_k Q_k^T Q_k)\phi > \Big)\ d\phi \\ =& \text{const} \exp\Big(\frac{1}{2}\langle f, A_{k,x} f \rangle \Big) \int \exp\Big(\big\langle \phi, a_k Q_k^T A_{k,x} f \big\rangle - \frac{1}{2} < \phi, G_{k,x}^{-1} \phi > \Big)\ d\phi \\ =& \text{const} \exp\Big(\frac{1}{2}\langle f, A_{k,x} f \rangle + \frac{a_k^2}{2} < f, A_{k,x} Q_k G_{k,x} Q_k^T A_{k,x} f > \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{332}$$

which gives the result.

References

[1] T. Balaban $(\text{Higgs})_{2,3}$ Quantum fields in a finite volume- I *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 85: 603-636, 1982.

[2] T. Balaban $(\text{Higgs})_{2,3}$ Quantum fields in a finite volume- II *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 86: 555-594, 1982.

[3] T. Balaban $(\text{Higgs})_{2,3}$ Quantum fields in a finite volume- III *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 88: 411-445, 1983.

[4] T. Balaban Regularity and decay of lattice Green's functions *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 89: 571-597, 1983.

[5] T. Balaban, Propagators and renormalization transformations for lattice gauge field theories -I, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 95: 17-40, 1984.

[6] T. Balaban, Propagators and renormalization transformations for lattice gauge field theories- II, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 96: 223-250, 1984.

[7] T. Balaban, Averaging operators for lattice gauge field theories. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 98: 17-51, 1985.

[8] T. Balaban, Propagators for lattice gauge field theories in a background field-III, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 99: 389-434, 1985.

[9] T. Balaban, Ultraviolet stability of three-dimensional lattice pure gauge field theories. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 102: 255-275, 1985.

[10] T. Balaban, Variational problem and background field in renormalization group method for lattice gauge field theories. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 102: 277-309, 1985

[11] T. Balaban, Renormalization group approach to lattice gauge field theories- I, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 109: 249-301, 1987,

[12] T. Balaban, Renormalization group approach to lattice gauge field theories- II, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 116: 1-22, 1988.

[13] T. Balaban, Convergent renormalization expansions for lattice gauge field theories, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 119: 243-285, 1988.

[14] T. Balaban, Large field renormalization-I, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 122: 175-202, 1989.

[15] T. Balaban, Large field renormalization-II, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 122: 355-392, 1989.

[16] T. Balaban, A low temperature expansion for classical N-vector models- I, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 167: 103-154, 1995.

[17] T. Balaban, Variational problems for classical N-vector models, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 175: 607-642, 1996.

[18] T. Balaban, Localization expansions- I, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 182: 33-82, 1996.

[19] T. Balaban, A low temperature expansion for classical N-vector models- II, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 182: 675-721, 1996.

[20] T. Balaban, A low temperature expansion for classical N-vector models- III, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 196: 485-521, 1998.

[21] T. Balaban, Renormalization and localization expansions- II, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 198: 1-45, 1998.

[22] T. Balaban, Large field renormalization operation for classical N-vector models, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 198: 493-534, 1998.

[23] T. Balaban, J. Imbrie, A. Jaffe, Effective action and cluster properties of the abelian Higgs model *Commun. Math. Phys.* 114: 257-315 , 1988.

[24] T. Balaban, M. O'Carroll, Low temperature properties for correlation functions in classcial N-vector spin models, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 199: 493-520, 1999.

[25] T. Balaban, M. O'Carroll, R. Schor, Block renormalization group for Euclidean fermions, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 122: 233-247, 1989.

[26] T. Balaban, M. O'Carroll, R. Schor, Properties of block renormalization group operators for Euclidean fermions in an external gauge field, *J. Math. Phys.* 32: 3199-3208, 1991.

[27] D.C. Brydges, H.T. Yau. Grad ϕ perturbations of massless Gaussian fields, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 129: 351–392, 1990.

[28] D.C. Brydges, A short course on cluster expansions, In K. Osterwalder and R. Stora, editors, *Critical phenomena, random systems, gauge theories*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1986.

[29] D.C.Brydges, Lectures on the renormalization group, in *Statistical Mechanics*, S. Sheffield and T. Spencer, eds., American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2009.

[30] D.Brydges, J.Dimock, and T.R. Hurd. The short distance behavior of ϕ_3^4. *Commun. Math. Phys.* 172: 143–186, 1995.

[31] D.C. Brydges, J.Dimock, T.R. Hurd. A non-Gaussian fixed point for ϕ^4 in $4-\epsilon$ dimensions, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 198: 111-156, 1998.

[32] C. Cammarota, Decay of correlations for infinite range interactions in unbounded spin systems, Commun. Math. Phys. 85: 517-528, 1982.

[33] J. Dimock, Quantum electrodynamics on the 3-torus. I - math-phys/0210020. II-math-phys/0407063,

[34] J. Feldman, K. Osterwalder, The Wightman axioms and the mass gap for weakly coupled ϕ_3^4 quantum field theories. *Ann. Physics* 97: 80-135, 1976.

[35] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, Positivity of the ϕ_3^4 Hamiltonian, *Fortschritte der Physik* 21: 327-376, 1973.

[36] J. Glimm, A. Jaffe, *Quantum physics: a functional integral point of view*, Springer, 1987.

[37] J. Imbrie, Renormalization group methods in gauge field theories. In K. Osterwalder and R. Stora, editors, *Critical phenomena, random rystems, gauge theories.* North-Holland, 1986.

[38] C. King, The $U(1)$ Higgs model, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 103: 323-349, 1986.

[39] E. Seiler, *Gauge theories as a problem of constructive field theory and statistical mechanics*, Springer, 1982.